

The Gazette



of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 49] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1963/ĀGRAHAYANA 16, 1885

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 26th November, 1963:—

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
229	S.O. 3258, dated 19th November, 1963.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.
230	S.O. 3259, dated 20th November, 1963.	Delimitation Commission.	Proposals in respect of the distribution of seats allotted to the State of Kerala in the House of the People and Legislative Assembly and delimitation thereof etc.
231	S.O. 3260, dated 22nd November, 1963.	Ministry of Finance	Prescribing twenty-five rupees as the fee for an application for renewal of a licence issued under sub-rule (1) or (1A) of the Defence of India Rules 1962.
232	S.O. 3261, dated 23rd November, 1963.	Election Commission, India.	List of Contesting Candidates in the election to the House of the People from Panjim Parliamentary Constituency.
	S.O. 3262, dated 23rd November, 1963.	Do.	List of Contesting Candidates in the election to the House of People from Marmagoa Parliamentary Constituency.
233	S.O. 3263, dated 23rd November, 1963.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.
234	S.O. 3264, dated 23rd November, 1963.	Cabinet Secretariat.	Amendments in the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961.

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
235	S. O. 3308, dated November, 1963.	26th Ministry of Labour & Employment	Appointing 1st December, 1963 on which certain Chapters of the Employees' State Insurance Act 1948 shall come into force in areas specified therein.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories).

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3330.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 43 of the Arms Act, 1959 (54 of 1959) and clause (1) of article 258 of the Constitution, the President with the consent of the State Government of Mysore, entrusts to the said Government, the functions of the Central Government under proviso c(i) and c(ii) of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.O. 1920 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3(ii) dated 13th July, 1963, subject to the conditions hereinafter mentioned, namely:—

- that the State Government shall, in the exercise of these functions, be subject to the like control by the Central Government as was exercisable by it immediately before the 1st October, 1962;
- that the State Government shall observe the policies and instructions laid down by the Central Government and shall not enunciate new policies or issue instructions inconsistent with those of the Central Government without the prior consent of that Government; and
- that the entrustment is limited to the District of Coorg under the administration of the State Government of Mysore and is without prejudice to the power of the Central Government to revoke or suspend licences throughout the whole or any part of India and to the overall jurisdiction of the Central Government.

[No. F. 18/1/63-P.IV.]

M. SIVAGNANAM, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi-11, the 30th November 1963

S.O. 3331.—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 3 of the Foreigners (Restricted Areas) Order, 1963, the Central Government hereby authorises all District Magistrates in the State of Assam to issue a permit under the said paragraph to any foreigner for entry into, or stay in, the whole of the State of Assam.

[No. 6/125/63-F.1.]

R. A. S. MANI, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 22nd November 1963

S.O. 3332.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, and of all other powers enabling him in this behalf, and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Fifth Amendment Rules, 1963.

2. In the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, in rule 5, after sub-rule (7), the following Note shall be inserted, namely:—

“NOTE.—In this rule, unless the context otherwise requires, “person” or “persons” shall include “a company or association or body of individuals, whether incorporated or not”.”.

[No. F. 8(5)-EV(B)/63(GPF).]

S.O. 3333.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, and of all other powers enabling him in this behalf, and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Contributory Provident Fund Fifth Amendment Rules (India), 1963.

2. In the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, in rule 5, after sub-rule (7), the following Note shall be inserted, namely:—

“NOTE.—In this rule, unless the context otherwise requires, “person” or “persons” shall include “a company or association or body of individuals, whether incorporated or not”.”.

[No. F. 8(5)-EV(B)/63(CPF).]

C. K. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 29th November 1963

S.O. 3334.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 22nd November 1963

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	13,28,04,000
Reserve Fund	80,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	1,77,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	73,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,25,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	8,00,00,000	National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
Deposits:—		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(a) Government		(i) State Governments	27,06,43,000
(i) Central Government	73,05,44,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	9,69,06,000
(ii) State Governments	11,62,07,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
(b) Banks		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	3,55,31,000
(i) Scheduled Banks	84,90,55,000	National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
(ii) State Co-operative Banks	2,47,24,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
(iii) Other Banks	4,68,000	Bills purchased and Discounted:—	
(c) Others	165,53,29,000	(a) Internal	
Bills Payable	32,94,67,000	(b) External	
Other Liabilities	41,23,64,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills	53,26,50,000
		Balances Held Abroad*	10,33,94,000
		Loans and Advances to Governments**	31,23,66,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) Scheduled Banks†	37,90,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	126,72,73,000
		(iii) Others	2,82,55,000
		Investments	273,30,32,000
		Other Assets	26,10,12,000
Rupees	577,81,58,000	Rupees	577,81,58,000

*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. Nil advanced to scheduled banks against usance bills under section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

†† Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 27th day of November 1963.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 22nd day of November 1963

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	13,28,04,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	2275,58,61,000		(a) Held in India	117,76,10,000	
Total Notes issued		2288,86,65,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	92,45,69,000	
			TOTAL		210,21,79,000
			Rupee Coin		119,33,84,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		1959,31,02,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
TOTAL LIABILITIES		2288,86,65,000	TOTAL ASSETS		2288,86,65,000

Dated the 27th day of November 1963.

P. C. BHATTACHARYYA,
Governor.

[No. F. 3(2)-BC/63.]

A. BAKSI, Jr. Secy.

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 30th November 1963

S.O. 3335.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 12 read with clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri Nani Ardeshir Palkhivala as a Director of the Central Board of the Reserve Bank of India in the vacancy caused by the death of Shri K. C. Mahindra.

[No. F. 3(68)-BC/63.]

B. J. HEERJEE, Under Secy.

(Department of Revenue)

STAMPS

New Delhi, the 7th December 1963

S.O. 3336.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty chargeable under the said Act on transfer deeds in respect of Government of India Defence Certificates executed in the following union territories, namely:—

1. Delhi.
2. Himachal Pradesh.
3. Manipur.
4. Tripura.
5. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.
6. The Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands.

[No. 28/F-No. 1/56/63-Cus.VII.]

ORDER

STAMPS

New Delhi, the 7th December 1963

S.O. 3337.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits with effect from the 1st day of July, 1963 the duty with which receipts mentioned below are chargeable under the said Act:—

1. Receipts given by a depositor or his nominee or heir in respect of repayment of deposits made by, or on behalf of, the depositor under the Compulsory Deposit (Income-tax payers) Scheme, 1963.
2. Receipts given by an employee [referred to in clause (d) of section 2 of the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Act, 1963 (21 of 1963)] or his nominee or heir in respect of repayment of deposits made by, or on behalf of, the depositor under the Compulsory Deposit (Employees) Scheme, 1963 while that Scheme was in force.
3. Receipts given by—
 - (i) any of the Scheduled Banks authorised to accept deposits under the Compulsory Deposit (Income-Tax payers) Scheme, 1963 and the Compulsory Deposit (Employees) Scheme, 1963 while that Scheme was in force, to the Reserve Bank of India or the State Bank of India or its subsidiary Banks;
 - (ii) an employer to the Head Post Office or the Reserve Bank of India or the State Bank of India or its subsidiary Banks;
 for the amount received by such Scheduled Banks or employer in reimbursement of refunds or repayments of deposits made under the Compulsory Deposit (Income-tax payers) Scheme, 1963, or the Compulsory Deposit (Employees) Scheme, 1963 while that Scheme was in force, as the case may be.

[No. 29 F. No. 1/77/63-Cus. VII/Stamps.]

M. G. VAIDYA, Under Secy.

(Department of Revenue)

(Company Law Administration)

Ned Delhi-1, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3338.—In continuation of Notification No. S.R.O. 3024, dated the 14th October, 1963 and in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (i) of Section 448 of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Kora Chandu, retired Deputy Registrar of High Court of Mysore, Bangalore to continue to be the part-time Official Liquidator attached to that Court from 1st November, 1963 to 31st December, 1963 or till a substitute is appointed in his place whichever is earlier

[No. Nil.]

P. B. SAHARYA, Under Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3339.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Revenue hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule annexed to its notification S.O. 65 (No. 2-Income-tax dated 5th January 1963) dated 12th January 1963, namely:—

In the said Schedule, for the existing entries in column 2 against "Vijayawada Range", the following entries shall be substituted namely:—

1. Vijayawada.
2. Masaulipatam.
3. Guntur.
4. Nellore.
5. Mica Circle, Nellore.
6. Palakole.

Explanatory Note.—The amendments have become necessary on account of creation of a new Circle in place of old Circle.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 72 (F. No. 50/1/63-IT).]

New Delhi, the 29th November 1963

S.O. 3340.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Revenue hereby makes the following amendment in the schedule appended to its Notification No. 20(F. No. 55/1/62-IT), dated the 30th April, 1963 published as S.O. 1293 on pages 1454 to 1457 of the Gazette of India Part II Section 3—Sub-section (ii) dated the 11th May, 1963:—

Against Serial No. 1, Assam, Manipur and Tripura under column 3:—

The existing entries shall be substituted by the following:—

"The State of Assam, the State of Nagaland and Union Territories of Manipur and Tripura".

This Notification shall come into effect from 1st December, 1963.

Explanatory Note.—The amendment has become necessary on account of assigning jurisdiction over the newly created State of Nagaland to the Commissioner of Income-tax, Assam.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 73 (F. No. 55/1/63-IT).]

S.O. 3341.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Revenue hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule appended to its Notification S.O. 1739 (28-Income-tax—F. No. 50/12/63-IT), dated the 22nd June, 1963, namely—

In the said Schedule against “‘A’ Range, Madras” and “‘B’ Range, Madras” under column 2, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

A—Range, Madras

1. Madras Circle I.
2. Madras City Circle II.
3. Madras City Circle V.
4. Madras (Special) Circle.
5. Special Circle, Madras.
6. Foreign Section, Madras.
7. Central Circle I and II, Madras.
8. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Madras.
9. Madras Special (Central), Circle.
10. Special Investigation Circle A, Madras.
11. Special Investigation Circle B, Madras.
12. Tax Recovery Circle, Madras.

B—Range, Madras

1. Madras City Circle III.
2. Madras City Circle IV.
3. Salaries Circle, Madras.
4. Special Survey Circle No. 1, Madras.
5. Special Survey Circle, Madras.
6. Thanjavur Circle.
7. Nagapattinam Circle.
8. Kancheepuram Circle.
9. Cuddalore Circle.
10. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Thanjavur.
11. Pondicherry Circle.

Explanatory Note: The amendments have become necessary on account of creation of new Income-tax Circles in the Commissioner's Charge.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 74 (F. No. 50/12/63-IT).]

J. RAMA IYER, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 29th November 1963

S.O. 3342.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (2) of Section 5 of the Goa, Daman and Diu (Laws) Regulation, 1962 (12 of 1962), the Central Government hereby directs that the Cinema Carbons (Control) Order, 1961 shall extend to and come into force in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu from the date of publication of this notification.

[No. 2(45)/60-LEEL.]

R. NATARAJAN, Under Secy.

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 21st November 1963

S.O. 3343/IDRA/6/4.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), read with rules 5(1) and 8 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, till the 18th August, 1965, Sarvashri J. C. Agarwal, S. J. Shahaney, R. V. Ramiah and Dr. C. A. Phalnikar, to be members of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry No. S.O. 2378, dated the 19th August, 1963, for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Machine Tools and directs that the following amendments shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

- (i) In the said Order, for entry No. 2 relating to Shri Ravi L. Kirloskar, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—
 2. Dr. C. A. Phalnikar, M/s. The Mysore Kirloskar Ltd., Harihar (Mysore State).
- (ii) In the said Order, for entry No. 16 relating to Shri G. N. Dalmia, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—
 16. Shri J. C. Agarwal, M/s. Textile Machinery Corporation Ltd., (TEXMACO), Belgharia, 24 Parganas, West Bengal.
- (iii) In the said Order, after entry No. 27 relating to Shri D. N. Gambhir, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—
 28. Shri S. J. Shahaney, Director General, Ordnance Factories, 6, Esplanade East, Calcutta-1.
 29. Shri R. V. Ramiah, Joint Director, Central Machine Tools Institute, Bangalore-4.

[No. 1(9)/L.Pr./63.]

New Delhi, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3344/IDRA/6/7.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), read with rule 5(1) of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, till the 13th October, 1965, Dr. G. S. Sidhu and Dr. K. S. Madhavan Pillai to be members of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry No. S.O. 3022 dated the 14th October, 1963, for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Drugs and Pharmaceuticals and directs that the following amendments shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

In the said Order, after entry No. 22 relating to Colonel Ved Parkash, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

23. Dr. G. S. Sidhu, Deputy Director Incharge, Regional Research Laboratory, Hyderabad.
24. D. K. S. Madhavan Pillai, Industrial Chemist, Office of the Director of Industries & Commerce, Trivandrum.

[No. 1(10)/L.Pr./63.]

S. P. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th November 1963

S.O. 3345.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 18A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri E. W. Isaacs, as a Member of the Board of Management of Messrs Jessop and Company Limited, Calcutta and makes the following further amendment to the Order in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 867, dated the 15th May, 1958 as continued in force by the

notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 1216, dated the 25th April, 1963, namely:—

In the said Order in the notification No. S.O. 867, dated the 15th May, 1963, under the heading "Members", after "(9) Shri P. K. Bardhan", the following shall be added, namely:—

"(10) Shri E. W. Isaacs".

[No. 8(34)/63-E.I.(M).]

S. RANGANATHAN, Secy.


(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1963

S. O. 3346.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 as amended in 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark, for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, as amended in 1961, and the rules and regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 15th December, 1963.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Products to which applicable	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	IS. 2048 	Parallel Keys and Key-Ways.	IS : 2048—1962 Specification for Parallel Keys and Key-Ways.	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2]

S. O. 3347.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for Parallel Keys and Key-Ways details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 15 December, 1963:—

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and title of relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Parallel Keys and Key-Ways.	IS : 2048—1962 Specification for Parallel Keys and Key-Ways.	One Kg.	5 nP. per unit with a minimum of Rs. 500.00 for production during a calendar year.

[No. MD/18:2]

S. K. SEN,
Head of the Certification Marks Department.

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 22nd November, 1963

S. O. 3348.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the licence No. CM/L-284 particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been cancelled with effect from 14 Nov. 1963.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name and Address of the Licencee	Article/Process covered by the Licence cancelled	Relevant Indian Standard
1.	CM/L-284 24-3-61	M/s. Huns Dewan Biscuits & Co., 158-Upper Duncan Road, Byculla, Bombay-8.	Biscuits (Excluding Wafer Biscuits) of the following varieties : Zoological, Kindergarten, Diamond, Gem, Flower, Charm and Ringlette.	IS : 1011-1957 Specification for Biscuits (Excluding Wafer Biscuits).

[No. MD/12:434]

LAL C. VERMAN,
Director.

MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

CORRIGENDUM

Bombay, the 16th November, 1963

S.O. 3349.—In the Ministry of Commerce & Industry's Notification No. S.O. 1204 dated the 20th April, 1963 published on pages 1369 to 1381 of the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (i), dated 27th April, 1963.

- (i) on page 1372 in line 54, for "price" read "prices".
- (ii) on page 1374 in line 22, for "Marketing" read "Marking".
- (iii) on page 1376 in line 60, for "Marketing" read "Marking".
- (iv) on page 1376 in line 66, for "(t) (1)" read "(t) (1) (1)".
- (v) on page 1378 in line 34, for "99/32" read "29/32".
- (vi) on page 1377, in line 19, for "11" read "12".
- (vii) on page 1377 in line 32, for "12" read "13".

[No. 21(2)/63-Control.]

R. DORAISWAMY,
Textile Commissioner.

TARIFF COMMISSION

New Delhi, the 26th November 1963

S.O. 3350.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Tariff Commission (Class III Posts) Recruitment Rules 1959, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Tariff Commission (Class III Posts) Amendment Rules, 1963.

2. In the Tariff Commission (Class III Posts) Recruitment Rules, 1959, after rule 5, the following rule shall be added, namely:—

"6. **Power to relax.**—Where the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do, it may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category of persons."

[No. 28(17)-Tar/63.]

S. R. BANERJEE, Under Secy.

(RUBBER CONTROL)

New Delhi, the 29th November, 1963

S.O. 3351—The following statement of accounts of the Rubber Board, Kottayam, for the year ended 31st March, 1962, is published in the Gazette of India in accordance with Rule 35(4) of the Rubber Rules, 1955 :—

RUBBER BOARD KOTTAYAM

Receipts and Payments Account for the year ended 31st March, 1962

RECEIPTS				PAYMENTS			
	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.		Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.
<i>To Balance on 1-4-61 :</i>				<i>By Administration :</i>			
With the State Bank of India . . .				Pay of Officers	36063·56		
Cochin, C/act.	10420·52			Pay of Establishment	98229·01		
With Central Bank of India, Kottayam, C/act.	127638·26			Allowances, Honoraria, etc.	54790·94		
				Other charges, contingencies etc.	97357·28	286440·79	
With Dist. Treasury, Kottayam,							
Personal Deposit Act.	63428·45			“Research :			
Cash on hand	1315·46			Pay of Officers	15411·93		
Stamps on hand	2236·99			Pay of establishment	19441·02		
T.A. Advance	4405·00			Allowances, Honoraria, etc.	19628·20		
Festival Advance	695·64			Other charges, contingencies etc.	469645·58	524126·73	
Loan for the purchase of motor cars, scooters etc.	2776·00			“Development :			
Other advances (Housing scheme loans etc.)	15396·20	228312·52		Pay of Officers	24107·74		
				Pay of establishment	64043·37		
Excise duty		16396·91		Allowances, Honoraria, etc.	59020·99		
Excise duty suspense (including cheques for collection)		13161·34		Other charges, contingencies etc.	2893204·44	3040376·64	3850944·06
Licence fee		14251·00					
Licence fee suspense (including cheques for collection)		36075·17		“Excise duty remitted to State Treasuries for credit of Central Government	1256224·27		
Receipts to be refunded		2312·50		Excise Duty collected by Revenue authorities and remitted to Government Treasuries and remittances by producers direct to State Treasuries for credit of Central Government	159701·39	1415925·66	
General fund		146115·60	228312·52				
To Rubber Board Provident Fund:							
Rs. 64·0—3% 1970-75 G.I. Devpt. loan	6412·62						
Rs. 21100—3% 1986 loan (G.I.)	18924·50						

Rs. 38600—4% 1963 T.C. loan .	38569.09	
Rs. 4200 —4% 1968 T.C. loan .	41543.41	
Rs. 8400—4% Madras loan '67	8379.00	
Rs. 10000—4% Madras loan '67	9647.00	
G.I. 3½% T.C. Savings Deposit	2500.00	
G.I. 4% T.C. Savings Deposit	7000.00	
National Plan Savings Deposit (12 years)	3000.00	
Post Office, S.B. A/c Kottayam .	6245.50	
Amount with State Bank of India, Cochin, C/act.	16575.31	
Cash on hand	1.31	158797.74
<hr/>		
To excise duty received direct in the Board's office and amount transferred from suspense etc. .	1370773.62	
Excise duty collected by Revenue authorities and remitted to Govt. Treasuries and remittances by producers direct to State Treasuries	159701.39	1530475.01
<hr/>		
Cess on rubber received from manufacturers and from sole crepe producers @ 30 nP. per kg.	1608868.56	
Cess on rubber remitted to Government Treasuries direct by manufacturers	179439.41	1788307.97
Grant from Central Government .		3318782.98
Excise Duty suspense (including cheques for collection)		3991100.00
Cess fee cheques awaiting collection		6689.59
Fees on account of Manufacturers Licence		44082.76
Fees on account of Dealers Licence		6206.00
Fees on account of New Planting		45900.00
Fees on account of Replanting		7152.00
		748.00
		<hr/>
		60006.00

Cess on rubber (received from manufacturers and sole crepe producers) remitted to Government Treasuries for credit to Central Government .	1552552.30	
Cess on rubber remitted by manufacturers direct to Government treasuries for credit of Central Government .	179439.41	1731991.71
<hr/>		
Licence fee remitted to State Treasuries for credit of Central Government		39493.00
		<hr/>
		3187410.37
<hr/>		
By Miscellaneous :—		
All India Services Provident Fund		2400.00
State Provident Fund		495.00
Staff Insurance		8017.64
Advances to Officers by State Government recovered and remitted to State Government Treasuries		336.00
Advances to Officers by Central Government recovered and remitted for credit of Central Govt. Staff Income tax		3400.00
		3265.62
<hr/>		
Sundry receipts refunded		7849.38
Sundry payments recoverable		2453.10
Sundry advances recoverable		1638.67
T.A. recovery of officers remitted to state treasury		53.95
Advance for clonal seeds refunded		77312.24
		<hr/>
		107221.60
<hr/>		
The Rubber Board Provident Fund : Interest and bank charges paid on the purchase of securities		222.49
Provident Fund Payment		850.00
Provident Fund advance		10454.00
		<hr/>
		11526.49

RECEIPTS		PAYMENTS	
Less amount transferred from last year's suspense		2923.45	57082.55
Miscellaneous :—			
Distribution of clonal seeds	23508.96		
Sale of seedlings from Board's nurseries.	14736.06		
Experiment station sundry receipts.	376.66		
Sundry receipts	807.73		
Interest on current a/c.	181.70		
Sale of pamphlets and advances for advertisements	3668.00	43279.00	
All India services P. Fund	2400.00		
State Provident Fund	495.00		
Staff Insurance	8017.64		
Advances to officers (states) recovered	336.00		
Advances to Officers (Central) recovered	3400.00		
Staff Income-tax	3265.62		
Sundry receipts refundable	10064.05		
Sundry payments recovered	2453.10		
Sundry advances recovered	1638.67		
T.A. recovery of officers (loaned)	53.95		
Amount received for clonal seeds refundable	77312.24	109436.27	152715.38
The Rubber Board Provident Fund:—			
Subscription by members	26922.99		
Contribution by Board	20786.33		
Interest on Government securities	4791.75		
Interest on Post Offices S.B. a/c.	184.86		
Amount recovered from loan to staff.	11209.00		
Income tax and surcharge.	811.68		
Interest on loan to staff	279.72	64986.33	
</			

G.I. 4 percent T.S. Deposit	7000.00	
National Savings Cert. 112 years)	3000.00	
Post Office S. B., Kottayam	12790.36	
Amount in Fixed Deposit with State Bank of Travancore, Kottayam	25000.00	
Amount with State Bank of India, Cochin, current account	22311.60	
Cash on hand	0.40	212257.58

TOTAL . . . 8022549.85

TOTAL . . . 8022549.85

KOTTAYAM ;
The 31st August, 1962.

Sd/- T.V. JOSEPH, Secretary.
Sd/- K.V. CHACKO, Accountant.

CERTIFICATE

I have examined the foregoing Accounts of the Rubber Board, Kottayam and obtained all the information and explanations that I have required and subject to the observations in the separate Audit Report, I certify as a result of my audit, that in my opinion these accounts are properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Board according to the best of my information and explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Board.

TRIVANDRUM;
The 16th July, 1963

Sd/- (E.J. MARKOSE)
Assistant Accounts Officer.

Sd/- (T.N. KURIAKOS)
Accountant General.
Sd/- Secretary.

[No.F. 20(5)Plant (B)/63]
B. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

(Office of the **Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports**)*Calcutta, the 30th July, 1963***NOTICES**

S.O. 3352.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 652385/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962 valued at Rs. 500 for the Import of Ball bearings above 1 inch in bore [serial No. 19(I)(IV)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D.K. Engineering and Metal Works, G.T. Road, or Circular Road, Batala did not exist.

In view of what is stated above M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. A 652385/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June, 1962 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

S.O. 3353.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 650339/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 13th August 1962, valued at Rs. 250 for the Import of Ball bearings above 2 inches in bore [Serial No. 19(I)(V)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D. K. Engineering & Metal Works, G.T. Road, or Circular Road, Batala, did not exist.

In view of what is stated above M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. A 650339/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 13th August 1962, are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

S.O. 3354.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 652388/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, valued at Rs. 500 for the Import of Ball bearings above 1 inch in bore [Serial No. 19(I)(III)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D. K. Engineering and Metal Works, G.T. Road or Circular Road, Batala, did not exist.

In view of what is stated above, M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. A 652388/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

S.O. 3355.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 652382/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, valued at Rs. 375 for the Import of Roller Bearings [Serial No. 19(2)(I)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D. K. Engineering and Metal Works, G.T. Road, or Circular Road, Batala, did not exist.

In view of what is stated above M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party who may be interested in the said licence No. A 652382/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

S.O. 3356.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 652384/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, valued at Rs. 250 for the Import of Ball bearings above 1 inch in bore [Serial No. 19(I)(III)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engineering and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D. K. Engineering and Metal Works, G.T. Road, or Circular Road, Batala, did not exist.

In view of what is stated above M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. A 652384/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

S.O. 3357.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. A 652383/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, valued at Rs. 250 for the Import of Ball bearings of 1 inch in bore [Serial No. 19(I)(I)-II] from the General Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it. It is noticed that the licence in question was obtained by misleading statement as the firm under the name of M/s. D. K. Engineering and Metal Works, G.T. Road, or Circular Road, Batala, did not exist.

In view of what is stated above, M/s. D. K. Engg. and Metal Works, Circular Road (Sukhdial Building) Batala, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. A 652383/61/AU/CCI/C, dated 5th June 1962, are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 56/63/CDN.]

P. K. BISWAS,
Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

NOTICE

Bombay, the 25th October, 1963

S.O. 3358.—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of International Trade propose to treat as *ab-initio*-void the following licences which have been obtained from the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, Bombay fraudulently in the name of a fictitious firm of M/s. Ghatage & Patil at 35-C/17, New Charni Road, Bombay unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Bombay, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice by the said M/s. Ghatage & Patil, 315-C/17, New Charni Road, Bombay or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it:—

S. No.	Licence No. & Date.	Value in Rs.	Description of goods.	I.T.C.S. No.	Area
1.	366742/60 19-5-61	500/-	Gaskets	292-95-97-IV.	S.C.A.
2.	366743/60 19-5-61	10291/-	M. V. Parts	—do—	S.C.A.
3.	361241 17-2-61	10291/-	M. V. Parts	—do—	S.C.A.
4.	366741/60 19-5-61	1000/-	Fuel Injection equipment.	—do—	S.C.A.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Ghatage & Patil, 315-C/17, New Charni Road, Bombay, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licences are hereby directed to return the said licences immediately to the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, Bombay.

[No. 1/208/62/CDN.II.]

R. R. KIRPALANI,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports, Bombay.

(Office of the Deputy Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1963

S.O. 3359.—Whereas M/s. C. Lal and Co., Raja Park, Adarsh Nagar, Jaipur or any Bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient cause, against notice No. DCCI.I(CLA)/43/61/5558 dated 26th August 1963 proposing to cancel Licence Nos. E113855/62 dated 20th October 1962 for import of Sodium Bicarbonate valued at Rs. 302/- and E113854/62 dated 20th October 1962 for import of Chemicals N.O.S. valued at Rs. 3053/- granted to M/s. C. Lal & Co., Raja Park, Adarsh Nagar Jaipur by the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports (Central Licensing Area) New Delhi, Govt. of India in the Ministry of International Trade in exercise of the powers conferred by the Clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order 1955, hereby cancel the said licences Nos. E113855/62 and 113854/62 issued to M/s. C. Lal & Co., Raja Park, Adarsh Nagar, Jaipur.

[No. DCCI.I(CLA)/43/61.]

New Delhi, the 5th November 1963

S.O. 3360.—Whereas M/s. C. Lal and Co., Ghree Walon Ka Rasta, Johri Bazar, Jaipur or any Bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient

cause, against Notice No. DCCI.I(CLA)/43/61/5557 dated 26th August 1963 proposing to cancel the following licences:—

Sl. No.	No. and date of the licence	Value	Description of goods
		Rs.	
1	E 271735/61 dt. 30/4/62	8143	Chemical N. O. S.
2	E 271733/61 dt. 30/4/62	605	Sodium bi-carbonate.
3	E 385759/60 dt. 15/3/61	1221	Selenium Metal Powder.
4	E 385758/60 dt. 15/3/61	2419	Sodium bi-carbonate.
5	E 385778/60 dt. 15/3/61	10178	Chemical N.O.S.
6	E 832317/59 dt. 30/3/60	2419	Sodium bi-carbonate.
7	E 632323/59 dt. 30/3/60	3663	Selenium and Selenium dioxide.
8	E 532316/59 dt. 30/3/60	2419	Sodium bi-carbonate.
9	E 382673/60 dt. 1/6/61	1209	Do.
10	E 632814/59 dt. 30/3/60	10179	Chemical N.O.S.
11	E 382704/60 dt. 29/5/61	8143	Do.
12	E 519752/60 dt. 10/6/60	2442	Selenium Metal Powder.
13	E 632322/59 dt. 30/3/60	2442	Selenium & Selenium dioxide.
14	E 632315/59 dt. 30/3/60	10179	Chemical N.O S.
15	E 519634/60 dt. 14/6/60	10179	Do.
16	E 519633/60 dt. 14/6/60	2419	Sodium bi-carbonate.

granted to said M/s. C. Lal & Co., Ghee Walon Ka Rasta, Johri Bazar, Jaipur by the Deputy Chief Controller of Imports and Exports (Central Licensing Area) Janpath Barracks, New Delhi Govt. of India, in the Ministry of International Trade in exercise of the powers conferred by the Clause-9 of the Import (Control) Order 1955, hereby cancel the said licences:

1. E 271735/61 dated 30th April 1962.
2. E 271733/61 dated 30th April 1962.
3. E 385759/60 dated 15th March 1961.
4. E 385758/60 dated 15th March 1961.
5. E 385778/60 dated 15th March 1961.
6. E 632317/59 dated 30th March 1960.
7. E 632323/59 dated 30th March 1960.
8. E 632316/59 dated 30th March 1960.
9. E 382673/60 dated 1st June 1961.
10. E 382704/60 dated 29th May 1961.
11. E 632314/59 dated 30th March 1960.
12. E 519752/60 dated 10th June 1960.
13. E 632322/59 dated 30th March 1960.
14. E 632315/59 dated 30th March 1960.
15. E 519634/60 dated 14th June 1960.
16. E 519633/60 dated 30th March 1960.

issued to M/s. C. Lal and Co., Ghee Walon Ka Rasta, Johri Bazar, Jaipur.

[No. DCCI.I(CLA)/43/61.]

RAM MURTI SHARMA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

[Branch Secretariat (Textiles)]

ORDER

Bombay, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3361.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the

following order further to amend the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, namely:—

1. This Order may be called the Cotton Textiles (Control) Fifth Amendment Order, 1963.

2. In the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, in clause 20C, the following further proviso shall be inserted immediately after the first proviso, namely:—

“Provided further that if, on account of the necessity to export cloth outside India or to meet the special requirements of the Central Government, a producer is not in a position to fully utilise the printing quota prescribed by the Textile Commissioner, he may, with the previous permission of the Textile Commissioner, accept for printing any cloth not produced in his mill so as to cover any deficiency in the quantity of cloth permitted to be printed”.

[No. F. 2(4)/63-Control.]

I. R. KAKAR, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND HEAVY ENGINEERING

(Department of Mines and Metals)

New Delhi, the 25th November 1963

S.O. 3362.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Mines and Fuel (Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel) S.O. No. 1334, dated the 2nd June, 1961, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule appended to that Notification;

And whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Mines and Fuel S.O. No. 1497, dated the 22nd May, 1963, under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, notice was issued specifying further period of one year commencing from the 2nd June, 1963, as the period within which the Central Government may give notice of its intention to acquire the said lands or any rights in or over such lands;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the coal is obtainable in the whole or any part of the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 3352.16 acres or 1357.62 hectares described in the Schedule appended hereto.

The plan of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Bihar) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the Office of the National Coal Development Corporation Ltd. (Revenue Section), “Darbhanga House”, Ranchi.

Any person interested in the aforesaid land may, within 30 days of the issue of this notification, file objection to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such lands to the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta.

SCHEDULE

PUNDI BLOCK

West Bokaro Coalfield

Drg. No. Rev/116/63

Dated 6-10-1963

(showing lands to be acqd.)

ALL RIGHTS

Sl. No.	Village	Thana	Thana No.	District Area	Remarks
1	Mandu . . .	Mandu	114	Hazaribagh	Part
2	Keke Basaudi . . .	”	115	”	”
3	Pundi . . .	”	116	”	”
4	Parej . . .	”	117	”	”
5	Barughutu . . .	”	118	”	”
6	Duni . . .	”	119	”	”
7	Bongahara . . .	”	120	”	”

Total :—3352.16 Acres (Approx.)
Or 1357.62 Hectares (Approx.)

Plot Nos. to be acquired in Village Mandu.—

2331 (P), 2334 (P), 2335, 2336 (P), 2349 (P), 2350 to 2628, 2629 (P), 2630, 2631 (P), 2632 to 2648, 2649 (P), 2650 (P), 2651 (P), 2718 (P), 2720 (P), 2975 (P), 2979 (P), 2982 (P), 2983, 2984, 2985 (P), 2986 (P), 3005 (P), 3006 (P), 3007, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012 (P), 3018 (P), 3023 (P), and 3134.

Plot Nos. to be acquired in village Keke Basaudi.—

119 (P), 172 (P), 173 (P), 176 (P), 177 (P), 208 (P), 211 (P), 213 (P), 214, 215 (P), 216 to 237, 238 (P), 239 to 250, 251 (P), 256 (P), 257 to 265, 266 (P), 268 (P), 270 (P), 271 (P), 272 to 277, 278, and 282.

Plot Nos. to be acquired in village Pundi.—

26 (P), 42 (P), 69 (P), 83 (P), 84 (P), 85 (P), 86 to 150, 151 (P), 152 to 196, 197 (P), 198 (P), 199, 200, 201, 202 (P), 204 (P), 207, 208 (P), 220 (P), 228 (P), 230 (P), 231 to 394, 395 (P), 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402 (P), 405 (P), 411 (P), 413 (P), 414 (P), 415, 416 (P), 417 (P), 424 (P), 425 (P), 426, 427 (P), 428, 429, 430, 431 (P), 432 (P), 433 to 495, 496 (P), 497 to 521, 522 (P), 523, 524 (P), 525 (P), 526 (P), 527 (P), 528 (P), 529 (P), 541 (P), 542 to 561, 562 (P), 563 (P), 567 (P), 568 (P), 569 (P), 570, 571 (P), 572 (P), 573 (P), 577 (P), 582 (P), 583, 584, 585, 586 (P), 588 (P), 589 (P), 590 to 746, 747 (P), 748 to 774, 775 (P), 776 to 786, 787 (P), 788 (P), 789 (P), 790 (P), 791 (P), 793 (P), 798 (P), 800 (P), 801 to 1418, 1419 (P), 1420, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1442, 1443 and 1444.

Plot No. to be acquired in village Parej.—

204 (P).

Plot No. to be acquired in village Barughutu.—

385 (P).

Plot Nos. to be acquired in village Duni.—

1 to 47, 48 (P), 49, 50, 54 (P), 55 (P), 56 (P), 57 to 94, 95 (P), 112 (P), 113 (P), and 651 (P).

Plot Nos. to be acquired in village Bongahara.—

1, 2, 3, 4 (P), 5 (P), 54 (P), 55 (P), 56, 57, 58, 59 (P), 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 (P), 68, 69 (P), 70, 71, 72, 73 (P), 84 (P), 85, 86, 87, 88 (P), 89 (P), 121 (P), 687 (P), 695 (P), 696 (P), 697 to 737, 738 (P), 739 to 782, 783 (P), 784, 785 (P), 786 (P), 787, 788 (P), 792 (P), 793, 794 (P), 795 to 855, 856 (P), 857 to 1003, 1004 (P), 1005, 1006, 1007 (P), 1076 (P), 1077 (P), 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082 (P), 1397, 1398, 1399, 1407, 1410 (P), and 1411.

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—

A—B line passes through plot Nos. 172, 119, 266, 268, 271 and 270 in village Keke Basaudi through Plot Nos. 2331, 2334, 2336, 2349, 2718, 2629, 2718, 2631, 2718, 2650, 2651, 2649, 2720, 2985, 2975, 2985, 2979, 2985, 2979, 2982, 2985, 2986, 3005, and 3006 in village Mandu and meets at point 'B'.

B—C line passes through plot Nos. 3006, 3012, along the northern boundary of plot No 3013, through plot Nos. 3023, 3018, 3023 in village Mandu and meets at point 'C'.

C—D line passes along the part common boundary of villages Mandu and Hesagara and meets at point 'D'.

D—E line passes along the common boundary of villages Pundi and Hesagara and meets at point 'E'.

E—F line passes along the part common boundary of villages Bongahara and Hesagara and meets at point 'F'.

F—G line passes through plot Nos. 4, 5, 59, 55, 59, 54, 59, 121, 67, 69, 73, 84, 88, 73, 89, 738, 687, 695, 738, 696, 738, 783, 788, 786, 785, 794, 792, 687, 1410, 1082, 1077, 1076, 1077, 687, 856, 1004, 1007, 1004 in village Bongahara, through plot Nos. 95 and 112 in village Duni and meets at point 'G'.

G—H line passes along the part left Bank of Bokaro River in village Duni and meets at point 'H'.

H—I—J lines pass through plot Nos. 122, 113, 54, 55, 56, 113, 48, 113 and 651 in village Duni and through plot No. 1419 in village Pundi and meet at point 'J'.

J—K—L lines pass through plot Nos. 1419, and 798, in village Pundi i.e., along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery and meet at point 'L'.

- L—M—N lines pass through plot Nos. 798, 800, 571, 572, 573, and 417 in village Pundi and meet at point 'N'.
- N—O line passes through plot Nos. 417, 569, 568, 567, 562, 563, 541, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 522, 529, 496, 425, 427, 424, 431, 432 and 395 in village Pundi *i.e.*, along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery and meets at point 'O'.
- O—P line passes through plot Nos. 395, 405, 402, 414, 416, 414, 411, 413, 411, 417, 220, 228, 220, 230, 220, 151, 208 and 151 in village Pundi *i.e.*, along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery and meets at point 'P'.
- P—Q line passes through plot Nos. 151, 202, 198, 204, 198, 197, 220, 582, 586, 588, 589, 577, 793, 747, 793 and 791 *i.e.*, along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery in village Pundi and meets at point 'Q'.
- Q—R line passes through plot Nos. 791 and 790 in village Pundi, and through plot No. 385 in village Barughutu *i.e.*, along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery and meets at point 'R'.
- R—S line passes along part left Bank of Bokaro River in village Barughutu and meets point 'S'.
- S—T line passes through plot No. 385 in village Barughutu, through plot Nos. 790, 789, 787, 778, 788, 789 and 42 in village Pundi and through plot No. 204 in village Parej *i.e.*, along the part common boundary of TISCO's West Bokaro Colliery and meets at point 'T'.
- T—U line passes along the part left bank of Bokaro River in village Parej and meets at point 'U'.
- U—A A line passes through plot No. 204 in village Parej through Plot No. 42, along the part southern boundary of Nala, then through plot Nos. 84, 85, 84, 83, 69, 26 along the common boundary of plot Nos. 1427 and 1436 in village Pundi and through plot Nos. 256, 251, 238, 208, 211, 213, 215, 119, 177, 176, 173 along part northern boundary of plot No. 172 in village Keke Basaudi and meets at point 'A'.

[No. C2-20(13)/60.]

A. NABAR, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 26th November 1963

S.O. 3363.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Ghee Grading and Marking Rules, 1938, the same having been previously published as required by the said section, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Ghee Grading and Marking (Amendment) Rules, 1963.

2. In the Ghee Grading and Marking Rules, 1938, for sub-rule (1) of rule 5, the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(1) The grade designation mark shall be securely affixed to each sealed container of ghee;

Provided that if the Agricultural Marketing Adviser to the Government of India is satisfied that the quality of ghee manufactured by any person in any modern dairy with the aid of automatic filling and packing machines, conforms to the provisions of rule 3 and that the requirement of affixture of the grade designation mark under this sub-rule will cause undue hardship to such person, the Agricultural Marketing Adviser may, by order, permit such person to print the number of the Certificate of Authorization issued to him under the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937, the word “Agmark” and the grade of the ghee, on the container of every package of ghee manufactured by him, prominently and in such other manner as may be directed by the Agricultural Marketing Adviser; and in cases where the container has been printed as aforesaid, such person shall be deemed to have complied with the provisions of this sub-rule.”

[No. F. 14-4/63-AM.]

V. S. NIGAM, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 29th November 1963

S.O. 3364.—The Municipal Corporation of Agra having elected Shri Ram Babu Verma as its representative on the Animal Welfare Board, the Central Government in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (59 of 1960) hereby makes the following further amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 921 dated the 20th March, 1962, establishing the Animal Welfare Board, namely:—

In the said notification,—

(a) in item 9, for the entry in the first column, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Shri Ram Babu Verma, Sabhasad, Nagar Mahapalika, Karim Lodge, Bagh Furzana Road, Agra”;

(b) in the entry in the second column relating to items 6, 6A, 7, 8 and 9 for the word “Ahmedabad”, the word “Agra” shall be substituted..

[No. 19-7/63-LD.]

K. C. SARKAR, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

New Delhi, the 27th November 1963

S.O. 3365.—In the matter of Charitable Endowments Act, 1890, and in the matter of the Lady Hardinge Medical College for Women and Hospital for Women and Children, Delhi, Fund.

On the application and with the concurrence of the Board of Administration for the Lady Hardinge Medical College and Hospital constituted by this Ministry's letter No. F. 4-3(4)/53-MI, dated the 12th June, 1953, and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. F. 4-3(2)/53-MI, dated the 12th June, 1953, namely:—

In the said Notification, in Schedule II, for the portion,

“Number of buildings including mosque, church etc. 70 in all

Approximate cost of buildings as assessed by the
Land and Development Officer, Delhi. Rs. 22,27,500

the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“Number of buildings including mosque, church etc. 71 in all

Approximate cost of buildings on 31st March 1960 Rs. 63,50,537”.

[No. F. 4-2/61-MII(ME).]

P. JOHARI, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 28th November, 1963.

S.O. 3366.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 33 of the Drugs Act, 1940 (23 of 1940) the Central Government hereby makes the following modification in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. F. 1-18/63-D dated the 22nd July, 1963, namely:—

In paragraph 2 of the said notification, for the words and figures “20th August, 1963”, the words and figures “20th December, 1963” shall be substituted.

[No. F. 1-18/63-D.]

BASHESHAR NATH, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT**(Transport Wing)****MERCHANT SHIPPING***New Delhi, the 30th November 1963*

S.O. 3367.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 11(3), 165, 206, 210, 238(1), 248(2), 253, 258(1), 287(1) and 358(2) of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958) read with sub-section (3) of section 461 of that Act, and all other powers hereto enabling, the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport No. 72-MA(1)/50, dated the 7th January, 1953, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification in the entries against sections 7(1), 71(1), 72(1), 74, 81, 116, 119, 151(1), 167(2), 170, 178, 214, 246(3), the entries "The Port Officer, Bedi" and "Ports of Bedi Bunder, Rozi, Salaya, Jodia, Pindara and Sikka" occurring in the columns relating to 'Officers' and 'Limits' respectively shall be omitted.

[No. 33-MA(2)/63.]

D. S. NIM, Dy. Secy.

(Civil Aviation Wing)*New Delhi, the 27th November 1963*

S.O. 3368.—Shri S. Mullick relinquished charge of the post of General Manager, Indian Airlines Corporation on the 16th November, 1963 (A.N.). He has been granted leave on average pay for four months with effect from the 17th November, 1963. On the expiry of the leave his services will be placed at the disposal of the Government of West Bengal.

[No. 3-CA(12)/63.]

K. GOPALAKRISHNAN, Dy. Secy.

DEPARTMENT OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS**(P. & T. Board)***New Delhi, the 28th November 1963*

S.O. 3369.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627, dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1st January, 1964, as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Kakinada Telephone Exchange.

[No. 31/27/63-PHB.]

S. RAMA IYER,

Assistant Director General (PHB).

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**ARCHAEOLOGY***New Delhi, the 28th November 1963*

S.O. 3370.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that the ancient monument specified in the Schedule attached hereto is of national importance,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 4 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 (24 of 1958), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to declare the said ancient monument to be of national importance.

Any objection made within two months after the issue of this notification by any person interested in the said ancient monument will be considered by the Central Government.

(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 27th November 1963

In the matter of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890

AND

In the matter of the Sharda Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science

S.O. 3371.—Whereas Dr. S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Sharda Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science, 112 Cross Road 11, Malleswaram, Bangalore-3, being the person who proposes to apply the funds of the Sharda Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science in trust for charitable purposes, has applied for vesting the funds mentioned in Schedule A annexed hereto in the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India and for the settlement of a Scheme for the administration of the said Funds.

2. It is hereby notified that the Central Government, in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 4 and 5 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), and upon the application as aforesaid doth hereby order that the monies set out in Schedule A annexed hereto shall, as from the date of publication of this notification be vested in the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India to be held by him and his successors in office (subject to the provisions of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890, and the rules framed thereunder from time to time by the Central Government) upon trust to hold the said monies and the income thereof in accordance with the trusts and terms set out in the Scheme set forth in Schedule B annexed hereto for the administration of the said funds.

And it is hereby further notified that the Scheme set forth in Schedule B annexed hereto has, under sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act, been settled for the administration of the said funds and under sub-section (3) of the said section 5 of the said Act, it is hereby further ordered that it shall come into force with immediate effect.

SCHEDULE A

Contribution of Rupees Three thousand nine hundred only in 4 per cent Treasury Savings Deposit Certificates.

SCHEDULE B

Scheme for the administration of the Sharda Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science.

1. The Endowment Fund shall be utilised for the following purposes:—

- (a) Furthering the cause of library science;
- (b) Organising periodically a course of lectures based on the latest thought and research on library science and called as the Sharda Ranganathan Lectures in Library Science and
- (c) Assisting in the publication of these lectures and of nascent thought in library science. The lectures can be delivered under the auspices of any university or any library association or any other body having similar interest and the funds can be spent in any part of India.

2. The Endowment shall be administered by a Committee of five. The first committee shall consist of the following members:—

1. Shri C. Seshachalam Chettiar, Treasurer, Madras Library Association, Madras-5, C/o Curzon and Co., Mount Road, Madras-2.
2. Shri A. Neelameghan, Reader, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore-3.
3. Shri P. N. Kaula, Librarian and Professor of Library Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi-5 (U.P.).
4. Shri T. R. Yogeswar, Design and Development Manager, Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd., Bangalore-13 and son of Dr. S. R. Ranganathan; and
5. Dr. S. R. Ranganathan, Honorary Professor, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore-3 (Secretary).

3. In the event of a vacancy arising in the committee, it shall be filled up by the continuing members bearing in mind that, as far as possible, the following interests are represented on the committee:

- (a) Library Association in the country;
- (b) Departments of Library Science and the library profession in the country; and
- (c) The family of Dr. S. R. Ranganathan.

4. During any vacancy in the Committee, the continuing member or members may act as if no vacancy had occurred.

5. The committee shall elect one among themselves to function as its Secretary with powers to operate the bank account and to undertake investments.

6. The committee shall

- (a) administer the income of the Endowment;
- (b) subject to the payment of the costs of administration, which shall be the first charge on the income of the Endowment, apply such income or such portion or portions thereof, as it thinks fit, from time to time, in the furtherance of the purpose and object of the Endowment;
- (c) select lecturers from time to time for delivering the Sharda Ranganathan Lectures in Library Science;
- (d) at all times, conform to and abide by any rules relating to the administration of Endowments which may be made by the Government of India from time to time under section 13(2) of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890; and
- (e) be competent to form bye-laws for the regulation of its business, the finances, the accounts of the Endowment and the like, and such bye-laws shall be as binding and effective as if they had been contained in this scheme.

7. The Committee may

- (a) in its discretion, convert the original securities pertaining to the Endowment into other equally or more profitable investments for the benefit of the Endowment;
- (b) by unanimous resolution, transfer the property and assets of the Endowment to any other authority which in the opinion of the Committee may be able to look after, maintain, and increase it for furthering the Endowment; and
- (c) do all acts which from time to time appear to it to be expedient or necessary for the accomplishment or furtherance of the purpose and object of the Endowment.

[No. F. 16-22/63-C.2.]

V. P. AGNIHOTRI, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 26th November 1963

S.O. 3372.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 4 of the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Act, 1951, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri J. C. Gulati, Settlement Officer in the Office of Regional Settlement Commissioner, Jullundur as Competent Officer, for the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such officers by or under the said Act, with immediate effect.

[No. 13(1)ARG/63.]

KANWAR BAHADUR,

Settlement Commissioner (A) & Ex-Officio Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 22nd November 1963

S.O. 3373.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 531, dated the 2nd March, 1961, namely:—

In the said notification, the following entry shall be omitted, namely:—

“(28) Shri M. M. Sinha.”

[No. 8/30/63-ML.]

New Delhi, the 26th November 1963

S.O. 3374.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1947 (32 of 1947), the Central Government has appointed with effect from the 1st November, 1963 (forenoon), Shri S. V. Krishnan, Deputy Secretary in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, as the Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner *vice* Shri K. Bag Singh.

S.O. 3375.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1946 (22 of 1946), read with sub-clause (i) of clause (a) of sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1948, the Central Government has appointed with effect from the 1st November, 1963 (forenoon), Shri S. V. Krishnan, Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner, Dhanbad, as the Welfare Commissioner, Bihar *vice* Shri K. Bag Singh.

[No. 14/13/63-MII-Part.]

R. C. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 22nd November 1963

S.O. 3376/PWA/Sec.7(2)(ii)/Rules.—In pursuance of clause (ii) of sub-section (2) of section 7 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (2), (3) and (4) of section 26, read with section 24, of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules, the same having been previously published as required by sub-section (5) of the said section 26, namely:—

THE PAYMENT OF WAGES (DEDUCTIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE FUND AND DEFENCE SAVINGS SCHEMES) RULES, 1963

1. Title, application and extent.—(1) These rules may be called the Payment of Wages (Deductions for National Defence Fund and Defence Savings Schemes) Rules, 1963.

(2) These rules shall apply to persons employed on railways, mines and oil-fields.

(3) They extend to the whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

2. Definitions.—In these rules,—

(a) ‘Act’ means the Payment of Wages Act, 1936;

(b) ‘section’ means a section of the Act.

3. Conditions for making deductions.—The conditions for making deductions in pursuance of clause (ii) of sub-section (2) of section 7 from the wages of the employed persons for contribution to the National Defence Fund or to any Defence Savings Scheme approved by the State Government with the written authorisation of the President or Secretary of the registered trade union of which the employed person is a member shall be as follows:—

(a) the president or, in his absence, the Secretary of such trade union shall forward,—

(i) in duplicate to the employer, a copy of the list of the employed persons who are members of the trade union indicating therein

the amount or extent of deductions which are to be made from the wages of each employed person and also, where the deductions are to continue for more than one wage period, the total period during which such deductions are to be made, and a copy of the resolution adopted at a meeting of such trade union authorising such deductions; and

- (ii) a copy of the said list and resolution to the person who acts as an Inspector for the purposes of the Act;
- (b) the employer shall display in a conspicuous place of the establishment one of the two copies of the said list and resolution received from the president or secretary, as the case may be, of the trade union, for at least a period of three consecutive days immediately preceding the day on which the deductions are to be made from the wages of the employed persons; and
- (c) if an employed person objects in writing to deductions being made from his wages upto the amount or extent of deductions indicated in the list displayed by the employer, no deductions shall be made from his wages except in accordance with the written authorisation of such employed person.

4. Repeal and savings.—The notification No. S.O. 3849/PWA/Sec. 7(2)(ii)/62, dated the 13th December, 1962, published in the Gazette of India Part II Sec. 3(ii), dated the 22nd December, 1962, is hereby rescinded but all acts done or purported to have been done under the said notification shall so far as they are not inconsistent with these rules, be deemed to have been done under these rules.

[No. 535/30/63/Fac.]

New Delhi, the 27th November 1963

S.O. 3377.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Sarvashri Santosh Kumar Hajra and Thoombil Mathai Chacko to be Inspectors for the whole of the State of West Bengal and the Union territories of Tripura and Andaman and Nicobar Islands for the purposes of the said Act or of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government, or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(49)/63-PF. I.]

S.O. 3378.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. SRO. 4141, dated the 19th December, 1957, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Hem Chandra Mahapatra to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Bihar for the purposes of the said Act or of any scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government, or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a mine or an oil-field or any controlled industry.

[No. 20(60)/63-PF.I.]

P. D. GAIHA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3379.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 670, dated the 27th February, 1962, published on pages 604—607 in Part II section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 3rd March, 1962, namely:

1. In Schedule I to the said notification, in the entries against serial No. 5,
 - (i) the entries "Annmanada" and "Malabar Potteries", occurring in columns 3 and 4 respectively shall be omitted,
 - (ii) against the area "Trinjalakuda" in column 3,

- (a) for the entry "3. K. P. Lonappan and Sons Rice and Oil Mills column 4,
the entry "3. Messrs K. P. Lonappan Sons Rice & Oil Mills" shall be substituted;
 - (b) for the entry "5. St. George Oil Flour & Rice Mill" in column 4,
the entry "5. Messrs St. George's Oil Flour & Rice Mills" shall be substituted,
 - (iii) against the area "Kodakara" in column 3, for the entry "1. Kodakara Match Factory" in column 4,
the entry "1. M/s. Kodakara Match Works" shall be substituted,
 - (iv) against the area "Mukkattukara" in column 3, for the entry "Cochin Power Industries", the entry "Messrs Cochin Power Industries" shall be substituted.
 - (v) the entries "Paravattani", and "Popular Automobiles" occurring in columns 3 and 4 respectively shall be omitted.
2. In Schedule II to the said notification,
- (i) in the entries against serial No. 2, in the area "Kasargode" in column 3,
the entry "4 Neeleswaran Tile Works" in column 4 shall be omitted,
 - (ii) in the entries against serial No. 7,
 - (a) against the area "Mala" in column 3, for the entry "Vittoppa Oil Mills" in column 4, the entry "Messrs Sree Vittoppa Oil Mills" shall be substituted;
 - (b) the entries "Mulankunnathukavu" and "Cochin Mahalekshmi Cotton Mills" occurring in columns 3 and 4 respectively shall be omitted;
 - (c) against the area Mulloorkara in column 3, for the entry "2. Solar Match Industry" in column 4, the entry "2. M/s. Solar Match Industries & Rice Mill" shall be substituted;
 - (d) in the area "Wadakkancherry" in column 3.
the entry "2 Cochine Mills" in column 4 shall be omitted.

[No. F. 6(7)/62-III.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3380.—Whereas an industrial dispute between Messrs Brooke Bond India Private Limited and their workmen was referred for adjudication to the National Industrial Tribunal at Bombay and its award was published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment as S.O. 1465, dated the 17th June, 1959, in Part II, Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 27th June, 1959;

And Whereas in the opinion of the Central Government, difficulties have arisen as to the interpretation of the said award on the questions specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 36A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said questions for decision to the Industrial Tribunal at Bombay constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (i) Whether as per para 76 of the award of the National Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, published as S.O. 1465, dated 17th June 1959, the dearness allowance payable to Salesman should be based on the monthly rate of dearness allowance payable to a clerk or its four weekly equivalent?
- (ii) Whether the directions given in para 165 of the said Award are applicable only to clerks, stenographers, typists and compounders or to all the employees including subordinate staff?

[No. 17/7/61/LRIV.]

S.O. 3381.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the United Commercial Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal consisting of Shri K. L. Gosain as the Presiding Officer, with its headquarters at Chandigarh, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether in view of the provisions contained in paragraph 529 of the Sastry Award Shri Moti Sagar Katyal, Assistant Cashier, was considered for the appointment to the post of Chief Cashier made by the management of the United Commercial Bank Limited, by direct recruitment, whereby Shri Joginder Singh, Sanghera was appointed?
- (2) If not, to what relief is Shri Moti Sagar Katyal entitled?

[No. 51(55)/63-LRIV.]

S.O. 3382.—Whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust and their workmen in respect of matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri M. R. Meher as the Presiding Officer thereof, with headquarters at Bombay and refers the said dispute to the said Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

- (a) Whether there are anomalies, in regard to any of the pay scales recommended by the tripartite Committee set up by the Resolution of the Central Government in the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Department of Transport, No. 23-PLA(91)/58, dated the 23rd August, 1958, published in Part I—Section 1 of the Gazette of India Extraordinary of the 25th August, 1958, in respect of the categories of posts listed in the annexure;
- (b) If so, what modifications, if any, should be made in the scales of pay recommended by the said Committee for the posts listed in the annexure, having regard to the directions contained in paragraph 2 of the said Resolution?

ANNEXURE

List of categories submitted by the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union.

1. Welder.
2. Fitter, Motorshop and Workshops.
3. Carpenter.
4. Deckhand, Grade II, Shore, Engineering Department.
5. Deckhand, Grade I, Shore, Engineering Department.
6. Tindal, Dredging and Barges.
7. Tindal, Workshops and Marine Survey.
8. Lightship Tindal.
9. Syrang, Dry Docks.
10. Clerk 'B' Scale, Stores Department.
11. Clerk 'A' Scale, Stores Department.
12. Senior Clerk, Stores Department.

List of categories submitted by the Bombay Port Trust Workers' Union.

1. Assistant Telephone Supervisor.

[No. 28/84/63-LRIV.]

New Delhi, the 30th November 1963

S.O. 3383.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Messrs. Goverdhan Hathi Bhai and Company, Cochin and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether denial of work by Messrs. Goverdhan Hathi Bhai and Company to Shri P. N. Vishnu, as a Tally clerk, from the 30th August, 1963 was justified. If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 28/95/63-LRIV.]

S.O. 3384.—Whereas, the employers in relation to Messrs. Peirce Leslie and Company Limited, Cochin, and the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union have jointly applied to the Central Government for reference of an industrial dispute between them to a Tribunal in respect of the matter set forth in the said application and reproduced in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the said Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union represents a majority of the workmen;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whereas a dispute exists between Messrs. Peirce Leslie & Company Limited and the headload workers on Willingdon Island represented by the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union and it is expedient that the matters specified in the enclosed statement which are connected with or relevant to the dispute should be referred for adjudication by a Tribunal, an application is hereby made under sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, that the said matters should be referred to a Tribunal for adjudication.

A statement giving the particulars required under rule 3 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, is attached.

Dated this the 17th day of October, 1963.

For the Management,

For PEIRCE LESLIE & COMPANY LIMITED,

Sd./-

Manager.

For the Workmen,

For THE COCHIN PORT CARGO LABOUR UNION,

Sd./-

Sd./-

President.

General Secretary.

Statement required under rule 3 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, to accompany the form of application prescribed under sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (a) Parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved | The parties to the dispute are the headload workers on Willingdon Island represented by the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union and Messrs. Peirce Leslie & Company Limited, Cochin. The establishment involved is the establishment of the Company at Willingdon Island. |
| (b) Specific matters in dispute. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the present arrangement in respect of cashew kernel cases from Quilon is justified or not? 2. To what relief are the parties entitled? |
| (c) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Headload workers } 120
Tally Clerks }
Coopers } <p>The number varies from day to day. (The employer contends that these men are casual employees. The Union contends otherwise.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Staff: Clerical & Subordinate: 16 (Permanent). |
| (d) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute. | Please see Item C(1) above. |
| (e) Efforts made by the parties themselves to adjust the dispute. | Discussions were held between the parties as well as before the Conciliation Officer (C), Ernakulam. |

[No. 28/85/63-LRIV]

S.O. 3385.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Calcutta Licensed Measurers Calcutta and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of workmen regarding the introduction of the system of rotational employment amongst the workmen in all three shifts is reasonable and if so, what should be the manner in which rotation is to be affected.

[No. 28/93/63-LRIV.]

S.O. 3386.—Whereas, the employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust, Bombay, and the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union have jointly applied to the Central Government for reference of an industrial dispute between them to a Tribunal in respect of the matter set forth in the said application and reproduced in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the said Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union represents a majority of the workmen;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the Bombay Port Trust and its workmen represented by the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union and it is expedient that the dispute specified in the enclosed statement should be referred for adjudication by a Tribunal an application is hereby made under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, that the said dispute should be referred to a Tribunal.

A statement giving the particulars required under rule 3 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, is attached.

Dated the 5th November, 1963.

Signature of

(Sd.) Illegible.

Principal Officer.
of the Corporation

Signature of

(Sd.) Illegible.

Vice-President of the
Trade Union.

(Sd.) Illegible.

General Secretary of
the Trade Union.

Statement required under rule 3 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, to accompany the form of application prescribed under Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

(a) Parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.

(1) The Trustees of the Port of Bombay, Port Trust Administrative Offices, Ballard Road, Bombay-1.

(2) Bombay Port Trust Employee's Union, Port Trust Kamgar Sadan, Nawab Tank Road, Mazagon, Bombay-10.

(b) Specific matters in dispute

"Whether the lascars employed on the Floating Crane 'Shravan' should be given any increase in pay for attending to the work of greasing of wires on the craft. If so, what should be the quantum of such payment and from what date should it be payable."

(c) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.

About 25,000.

(d) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

About 13.

(e) Efforts made by the parties themselves to adjust the dispute

The parties have held discussions but have been unable to reach a settlement; they have, however, agreed to refer the matter to adjudication.

(Sd.) Illegible.

Vice-President of the
Trade Union

(Sd.) Illegible.

Principal Officer of
the Corporation

Secretary Bombay Port Trust.

(Sd.) Illegible.

General Secretary of
the Trade Union.

[No. 28/101/63/LRIV.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 27th November 1963

S.O. 3387.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the West Chirimiri Colliery and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd November, 1963.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY.

REFERENCE No. CGIT-44 of 1962.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the West Chirimiri Colliery.

AND

their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri Salim M. Merchant,—*Presiding Officer*.

APPEARANCES:

For the employers.—Shri B. L. Sharaf, Law Secretary, Central India Coal-fields Mining Association, with Shri Gurmukh Singh, Manager, West Chirimiri Colliery.

For the workmen.—Shri Gulab Gupta, General Secretary, M. P. Colliery Workers' Federation, Chirimiri, Madhya Pradesh

STATE: Madhya Pradesh .

INDUSTRY: Coalmining.

Bombay, the 20th November 1963

AWARD

The Central Government by the Ministry of Labour and Employment's Order No. 5/24/62-LR. II, dated 19th November, 1962, made in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), was pleased to refer the industrial dispute between the parties above named in respect of the subject matters specified in the following schedule to the said order, to me for adjudication:—

“SCHEDULE”

“Whether the management of West Chirimiri Colliery was justified in terminating the services of Shri H. M. Chaudhury, Medical Officer of the Colliery, with effect from the 1st August, 1962? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

2. After the usual notices were issued on the parties, the Manager, West Chirimiri Colliery of Indra Singh and Sons Pvt. Ltd., filed his written statement dated 10th December, 1962, and the union filed its statement of claim on 27th December, 1962, to which the management filed a rejoinder in reply dated 11th January, 1963, after which the dispute was taken up for hearing at Chirimiri and the hearing concluded on 14th October, 1963.

3. The union in its written statement of claim dated 27th December, 1962, has stated that Shri H. M. Choudhury was employed as a Medical Officer at the West Chirimiri Colliery on 8th August, 1961, on a permanent basis, on a consolidated salary of Rs. 450 per month plus free unfurnished housing accommodation and free water supply and that the total monthly emoluments of Shri Chaudhury including the cost of housing and other benefits amounted to Rs. 400 per month; that according to the nature of duties performed by Shri Chaudhury he was a workman as defined by section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In para 4 of its written statement the union has alleged that the services of Dr H. M. Chaudhury were terminated because the Manager bore ill will towards him; that the Manager had on many occasions behaved rudely towards him for which he had apologised; that no charge sheet was served on Dr. Chaudhury and no enquiry was held before terminating his services; that the action of the management in terminating Dr Chaudhury's services was thus in violation of the principles of natural justice, fair play and in violation of the provisions of the standing orders of the company. It has urged that the termination of the services of Dr Chaudhury were clearly illegal and unjustified. In para 5 of its written statement of claim the union has urged that the Manager bore ill will towards Dr. Chaudhary because the Manager had asked Dr Chaudhury to refrain from prescribing medicines which are enlisted by the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation because if such medicines were prescribed and the patients were required to purchase them from outside, the management would have to pay the costs, thereof that the management of the colliery does not keep all the enlisted medicines in its dispensary; that the doctor had not accepted the suggestion of the Manager and had prescribed such medicines whenever he felt it necessary, leading to ill will between the

Manager and the doctor. In para 6 of its written statement of claim the union has stated that the immediate cause for the dismissal of Dr. Chaudhary was that he prescribed penicillin and streptomycin for the wife of Shri Makhan Singh, President of the West Chirimiri Branch, of the Federation, much against the wishes of the Manager; that the Manager does not recognise the Federation or its branch union at the colliery; that he always encourages and indulges in anti-union activities and is not on good terms with Makhan Singh; that as Makhan Singh did not get proper treatment for his wife he reported the matter to the Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner, that the Manager considered this to be a report by the doctor against him and dismissed him from service and that the dismissal was thus actuated by malice. In para 7 of its written statement of claim the union has stated that the order of termination was originally to take effect from 11th August, 1962, but when the Federation raised an industrial dispute and conciliation proceedings were fixed on 8th August, 1962, by the Conciliation Officer, Jabalpur, the Manager terminated the services of Dr. Chaudhary with effect from 1st August, 1962, which showed that the Manager was actuated by malice and vengeance and wanted to harass the doctor; that this had amounted to victimization of the doctor for treating the wife of the union President. In para 8 of its written statement of claim the union has alleged that in view of the premises aforesaid the action of the Manager in dismissing Dr. Chaudhary was illegal, unjustified and malicious and amounted to victimisation and deserved to be set aside by the Tribunal; that the charges mentioned in para 22 of the management's statement were false, frivolous and an after thought; that no charge sheet whatever was issued against Dr. Chaudhary on any of these charges and the management was, therefore, estopped from making any such allegation now. In para 10 of its written statement the union has specifically stated that Dr. Chaudhary was out of job since August last and was depending on the help of his relatives. The union, therefore, claimed that he should be reinstated with full back wages.

4. The company in its written statement dated 10th December, 1962, has urged a preliminary objection that Chaudhary being a medical officer was not a workman and that the alleged dispute does not constitute an industrial dispute and therefore, the reference under section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act was improper and illegal, and this Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain the same. The company in paragraphs 2 to 11 of its written statement has urged a number of arguments in support of its legal contention and I shall deal with them when dealing with the issue whether Dr. Chaudhary was a workman as defined by section 2(s) of the Act and whether an industrial dispute could be raised with regard to him.

5. The company in paragraph 13 of its written statement has stated that Dr. Chaudhary was appointed as Medical Officer on the terms and conditions mentioned in the company's letter of appointment dated 27th April, 1961, (exhibit W-1) and it has relied upon conditions (3) and (4) thereof. Condition 3 provided that Dr. Chaudhary would be on probation for a period of six months with effect from the date of his reporting for duty at the management's colliery and after satisfactory completion of the period of probation he would be confirmed as a permanent employee and would be subject to the colliery's certified standing orders and other rules and regulations as may be in force from time to time. Condition 4 stated that on satisfactory completion of the period of probation as mentioned above, he would be fixed in the time scale of overall consolidated pay of Rs 450, Rs 25 (annual)—Rs 650 and that he would not be eligible to any allowance or bonus over and above the said consolidated salary; that Dr. Chaudhary by his letter, dated 27th July, 1961 (exhibit E-3), had accepted these terms and conditions of service which therefore, constituted his contract of service with the company; that there was no satisfactory completion of the period of probation of Dr. Chaudhary and he was, therefore, not confirmed after the expiry of six months of his joining duty on 8th August, 1961; that Dr. Chaudhary well knew that it was necessary for him to apply for confirmation on completion of six months' satisfactory service and it was, therefore, that he had written the letter, dated 12th March, 1962 (exhibit W-2), to the Director of the company at Indranagar Jamshedpur, asking for a letter confirming him as a permanent medical officer at the West Chirimiri Colliery; that the head office had intimated to Dr. Chaudhary by its letter, dated 14th March, 1962, that he should apply for confirmation through proper channel so that appropriate action may be taken after receipt of the Manager's report about satisfactory completion of six months' service. The management has contended that as the work of Dr. Chaudhary was not found satisfactory he was not confirmed in his post at the expiry of the probationary period; that by the lapse of six months' probationary period alone Dr. Chaudhary could not claim automatic confirmation in service; that no illegality had been committed in terminating the services of Dr. Chaudhary because he had been served with one month's notice which was in conformity with clause

19 of the company's standing orders: that under clause 21 of the standing orders Dr. Chaudhary was not entitled to any notice or pay for the notice period. In para 22 of its written statement the management has stated that it was justified in terminating the services of Dr. Chaudhary because of negligence of duty of which it has given seven instances, wilful insubordination and indiscipline of which it has given three instances, making false allegations amounting to subversion of which it has given two instances and for issuing a false certificate to one workman regarding his age in order to qualify him for employment.

6. The company in its rejoinder in reply, dated 11th January, 1963, to the union's written statement of claim, dated 27th December, 1962, has denied the various allegations made by the union; it has *inter alia* stated that the Manager never asked Dr. Chaudhary to refrain from prescribing any kind of enlisted medicines; that the management keeps and makes available enlisted medicines and other medicines beyond those prescribed; that the reports of the Welfare Department of the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation about the dispensary at the West Chirimiri Colliery and the consequent subsidy granted to this dispensary by the same organisation bore testimony to the fact that the company was conforming to the standards laid down by the Coalmines Welfare Organisation for its dispensary; the management has also denied the allegations of anti-union activities on the part of the Manager and has stated that the management throughout negotiated with the Federation and its branch at the colliery in respect of all matters; that members of this union were serving on various bodies such as the Works Committee, the Canteen Managing Committee and the Miners Hostel Committee. The management has denied the allegations of malice, vengeance, harassment and victimisation. The management has denied the statement of the union that Dr. Chaudhary was unemployed till the date of its written statement. The management has stated that according to its information Dr. Chaudhary on leaving the West Chirimiri Colliery practised in Calcutta for some time and from November 1962 had taken up service with the National Coal Development Corporation Ltd.; that Dr. Chaudhary was not out of job and he was trying under the false plea of unemployment to extract money out of the employers. It has, therefore, urged that Dr. Chaudhary does not deserve either reinstatement or any relief.

7. At the hearing of the dispute at Chirimiri the union examined Dr. Chaudhary and Shri B. D. Kuldip, Secretary of the West Chirimiri Colliery Union and the employers examined Shri Gurnukh Singh, Manager of the West Chirimiri Colliery.

8. The first question that falls for determination is whether Dr. H. M. Chaudhary is a workman within the definition of that term contained in section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. If the answer to that issue is in the affirmative then the preliminary legal contention urged by the company must fail. Now, the term "workman" as defined after the amendment by Act 36 of 1956, of section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947), is as follows:—

"workman" means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any skilled or unskilled manual, supervisory, technical or clerical work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person—

- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity;
- (iv) who being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding five hundred rupees per mensem or exercises either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature."

This definition came into force from the 29th August, 1956, that is to say from a date earlier than the date on which Dr. Chaudhary joined the services of this company. It has been argued by Shri Gulab Gupta that Dr. Chaudhary was performing technical and supervisory duties in the discharge of his work as a Medical Officer of the company. From the oral and documentary evidence on record I hold that Dr. Chaudhary was doing technical work in the discharge of his duties as a medical officer of the company. The term "technical" has come in for judicial consideration. In the case of the Bengal United Tea Company Ltd., and Ram Labhaya and others (1962 II LLJ p. 37) their Lordships of the

Assam High Court (C P. Sinha CJ and S Mehrotra J) in considering the definition of section 2(s) of the Act have observed —

“The dictionary meaning of the expression “technical” is something pertaining to art, particularly useful art or applied science belonging to or in the language of a particular art, department of knowledge or skill. As to the person it means skilled in or practically conversant with some particular art or subject. A doctor has to possess human anatomy. They spend years acquiring this function includes diagnosis and prognosis. It is technical nature. A layman cannot perform these duties. They have to possess a knowledge of specialised character. It cannot, therefore be said that a medical officer does not come within the meaning of the work “technical” and his work is not of a technical character. Hence a person employed as an assistant medical officer of an estate would be a workman as defined by section 2(s) of the Act.”

Shri Gulab Gupta has also relied upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of the State of Bombay and others and Hospital Mazdoor Sabha and others (1960 I LLJ p 251) and Lalit Hari Ayurvedic College Pharmacy, Pilibhit and Lalit Hari Ayurvedic College Pharmacy Workers' Union (1960 I LLJ pp 250-51). In the former case the Supreme Court held that a hospital and in the latter case a pharmacy were industries as defined by section 2(j) of the Act. Shri Gulab Gupta has also relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of the workmen of the Dimakuchi Tea Estate Assam Chah Karmachari Sangh and Dimakuchi Tea Estate (1958 I LLJ p 500) in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court in considering the definition of the term “workmen” under 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act before its amendment by Act 36 of 1956 read with the definition of “industrial dispute” in section 2(k), held that the expression “any person” occurring in section 2(k) . . . , whose employment or non-employment or terms of employment . . . about the workmen as a class have a direct or substantial . . . they have under the scheme of the Act a community of interest. At page 513 of the report it was observed by their Lordships as follows:—

“In the case before us, Dr K P Banerjee was not a “workman” He belonged to the medical or technical staff—a different category altogether from workmen. The appellants had no direct or substantial interest in his employment or non-employment, and even assuming that he was a member of the same trade union, it could not be said, on the tests laid down by us that the dispute regarding his termination of service was an industrial dispute within section 2(k) of the Act”

This was a case prior to the amendment of the definition of the term “workman” and before the term “supervisory” and “technical” were added to the definition of the term “workman”. The observations of their Lordships quoted above clearly indicate that their Lordships considered the work of a doctor as “technical” and therefore under the amended definition of the term “workman”—a doctor would be a workman. In my opinion with great respect the Judgment of the Assam High Court referred to earlier (1962 I LLJ p 37) is supported by the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of the Dimakuchi Tea Estate. I am more than satisfied, on the record of the oral and documentary evidence in this case that Dr Chaudhary, was doing technical work in the discharge of his duties as Medical Officer of the Colliery and he was, therefore, a “workman” as defined by the amended Section 2(s) of the Act. In view of this finding it is not necessary to consider whether he was also doing supervisory work and would be a workman because his total emoluments were less than Rs 500 per month.

9. It has been urged on behalf of the management by Shri Saraf that Shri Chaudhary was a medical officer and he tried to distinguish the facts of the instant case from the facts of the case of the Bengal United Tea Co Ltd., where an assistant medical officer was involved. He has also sought to draw a distinction between the duties of a doctor and a medical officer. I am not impressed by either of these contentions because in my opinion though designated as Medical Officer Dr Chaudhary was essentially discharging the duties of a doctor and I am more than satisfied that in the discharge of these duties he was doing technical work. I therefore reject the preliminary legal contention of the company and hold that Dr Chaudhary was a workman as defined by section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act and that as this dispute relates to his employment or non-employment in the colliery, it is an industrial dispute under section 2(k) of

the Act and the reference is therefore, a valid reference and I have jurisdiction to entertain the same.

I now proceed to discuss the dispute on its merits. The only question to be decided is whether the management was justified in terminating the services of Dr. H. M. Chaudhary with effect from 1st August 1962. Dr. Chaudhary was appointed in service by the company's letter dated 24th July 1961, (Ex. W. 1) paragraph 3 of which provided that he was to be on probation for a period of six months with effect from the date of his reporting for duty at the colliery and after satisfactory completion of the period of probation he would be confirmed as a permanent employee and be subject to the colliery's certified standing orders and other rules and regulations. Now, it is admitted that Dr. Chaudhary reported himself for duty on 8th August 1961 and the union's case is that on the expiry of six months from that date i.e. on 8th February 1962, Dr. Chaudhary automatically became a permanent employee. The company on the other hand contends that it was only on completion of six months satisfactory service and upon an order of the company confirming him in service that he could be deemed to have become permanent. In my opinion, it is quite clear that Dr. Chaudhary himself considered the latter to be the correct interpretation of the terms and conditions of his appointment as stated in exhibit W-1, because on 12th March 1962 after he had completed six months' service in the company he addressed a letter to the Director of Indra Singh & Sons Pvt. Limited at Indranagar, Jamshedpur, (exhibit W-2) in which he *inter alia* stated as follows:—

" I have already completed my probationary period of six months of my service on 7th February 1962. . . So I shall be obliged if you kindly send me a letter confirming me as a permanent medical officer of your West Chirimiri Colliery.

Anticipating your earliest reply."

To this the company replied by its letter dated 14th March 1962 (exhibit W-3) asking Dr. Chaudhary to submit his application through the Manager of the colliery for necessary action. Now, Dr. Chaudhary in his evidence has stated that thereafter, he had submitted an application to the company through the Manager of the colliery asking to be made permanent. The Manager of the colliery Shri Gurmukh Singh in his evidence before me denied having received any such application from Dr. Chaudhary and Dr. Chaudhary was not able to produce a copy of his alleged application to the Manager and beyond his bare word there is nothing to indicate that he had made any such application. Curiously enough the written statement of claim filed on his behalf in this case also contains no such averment. I am, therefore, inclined to the view that considering that Dr. Chaudhary, as admitted by him in cross-examination, had in February 1962 made an application to the National Coal Development Corporation for appointment as a Medical Officer in its collieries and had also applied to the Manager of the West Chirimiri Colliery for a no objection certificate on 13th April 1962 (exhibit E-15) which was granted to him on 17th April 1962 (Ex. 16), it does appear to me that Dr. Chaudhary had on receipt of the company's letter of 14th March 1962 (exhibit W-3) changed his mind and had not sought confirmation of his service in the company because he was anxious to secure employment with the National Coal Development Corporation to which he had earlier applied for appointment as Medical Officer in its collieries. I am, therefore, more than satisfied that Dr. Chaudhary had not become confirmed in his post as Medical Officer on the expiry of six months of his joining service on 8th August 1961 and that under the terms of his appointment he had, till the date his services were terminated, continued to be a probationer. Shri Saraf has relied upon the following cases for his contention that there can be no automatic confirmation when there is a proviso or condition of satisfactory service in the letter of appointment as a probationer.

Chief Conservator of Forests U.P. and D.A. Lyall (1961 II LLJ p. 251) where a full Bench of the Allahabad High Court rejected the theory of automatic confirmation on efflux of time. To the same effect is the judgment of the Calcutta High Court in the case of Barbilas Biswas v. Commissioner of Income-Tax (1962 I LLJ p. 541). Shri Saraf has also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sukhban Singh v State of Punjab (1963 I LLJ p. 671) where it was held that a probationer cannot be deemed to have been automatically confirmed and claim the status of a higher post.

11. Although the above cases relate to Government servants the underlying principle enunciated therein can well apply in a case like this, where a workman who is a probationer claims that by efflux of time he has become confirmed in the post, particularly when the terms and conditions of his employment provide a condition of satisfactory service prior to confirmation. I, therefore, hold that Dr. Chaudhary had not become confirmed and was, therefore, not a permanent employee but

continued to be a probationer till the date his services were terminated and the fact that he himself on completion of six months' service had applied to the Director of the company for confirmation indicates that he clearly understood that that was the condition of his service. The management has, next, contended that since Dr. Chaudhary had not become confirmed in service the termination of his service by the company's notice dated 2nd July 1962 (exhibit W-4) was legal and proper and that is the question that next falls for consideration.

12. Now, by its letter dated 2nd July 1962 (Ex. W-4) the company informed Dr. Chaudhary that it has been decided to terminate his services. The letter went on to state that normally one month's notice would be considered sufficient for the termination of his services but that as a special case he was being given six weeks' notice from that date and that he would be relieved of his duties on 11th August, 1962. It is admitted that thereafter on 1st August 1962 Dr. Chaudhary was served with a letter from the Manager of the colliery (exhibit W-5) intimating to him that he was relieved of his duties as a medical officer from that date and that he would be paid half month's salary in lieu of the remaining days of the notice period. He was asked to collect his final settlement of wages any time that day and arrange to hand over vacant possession of the company's quarters by the evening of that day and to return all dispensary equipments and or any records belonging to the company which may be in his possession. To this, Dr. Chaudhary replied by his letter of 8th August 1962 (Ex. W-6) in which *inter alia*, he asked to be paid his salary for the month of July 1962. He had stated that he had requested his salary to be paid for the month of July 1962 only *cide* union's letter dated 1st August 1962 but that the Manager had refused to pay it except in full and final payment. He, however, stated that he was prepared to accept the same under protest and requested the Manager to advise the Cashier to pay the same to him accordingly.

13. It, however, appears, as stated in the Conciliation Officer's failure report (exhibit W-22), that on 9th July 1962 the Federation had addressed a letter to the Conciliation Officer, (Central) Jabalpur, raising an industrial dispute over the management's letter of 2nd July 1962 (exhibit W-4). It appears that the Conciliation Officer had thereupon issued a letter dated 19th July 1962 requesting the Manager, West Chirimiri Colliery to send its comments by the 29th July 1962. In the meantime on the 21st July 1962 a telegram appears to have been sent by the union stating that the situation at West Chirimiri Colliery had become tense over the dismissal of the doctor and requesting for holding of conciliation immediately and thereupon the Conciliation Officer issued a notice on 28th July 1962 fixing conciliation at Jabalpur on 2nd August 1962. It seems that on 30th July 1962, Shri Gulab Gupta of the union sent a telegram to the Conciliation Officer requesting that the conciliation proceedings be fixed at Jabalpur on 3rd August 1962. It appears that on 1st August 1962 the Manager of the colliery sent a telegram to the Conciliation Officer that he was not attending the conciliation proceedings on the 2nd August 1962 because Dr. Chaudhary was not a workman and that a detailed letter would follow. In its letter dated 1st August 1962 the management in reiterating its contention that Dr. Chaudhary was not a workman informed the Conciliation Officer that the services of Dr. Chaudhary had since been terminated and that he was no longer in its service. Accordingly the management did not attend the conciliation proceedings on 3rd August 1962. It, however, appears that the management had sent its comments to the Conciliation Officer which had reached him on 30th July 1962 but neither party has produced the same. However, the management as stated earlier did not attend the conciliation proceedings on 3rd August 1962.

14. Now, on these facts a contention has been raised by Shri Gulab Gupta that the termination of the services of the doctor on 1st August 1962 was illegal under section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act as conciliation proceedings were pending on that day. But from the facts narrated above, it is clear that the conciliation proceedings were to commence on 2nd August 1962, and was subsequently postponed to 3rd August 1962, whilst the termination of the services of Dr. Chaudhary was effected on 1st August 1962 before the conciliation proceedings were due to commence. I, therefore, consider that there is no substance in this contention of Shri Gulab Gupta. It is significant that the union had at no earlier stage even faintly suggested that the termination was bad because of the violation of section 33 of the Act by the management.

15. I am of the opinion that as Dr. Chaudhary was a probationer till the date of termination of his service, he was not entitled to a month's notice of termination and that strictly speaking under the terms of paras 3 and 4 of his letter of appointment he was not governed by the provisions of the certified standing orders of the company because the letter of appointment clearly stated that he was to be governed by the certified standing orders of the company after he was confirmed and had become a permanent employee which status he had not acquired on the date of his

termination. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the termination of his service by the company's notice of 1st August 1962 was proper valid and legal. Much has been made by Shri Gulab Gupta of a reference to the increment which he would have earned on 8th August 1962 contained in the Manager's letter to the Conciliation Officer dated 1st August 1962. But that reference was made in quite a different context and what the company was arguing in that letter was that even if Dr Chaudhary would have earned an increment on 8th August 1962 had he continued in service he would still not have been a "workman" as defined by the Act, because his monthly earnings would have exceeded Rs 500/- per month.

16 The management in its written statement has stated that the termination of Dr Chaudhary's services was justified for the acts of (a) negligence in duty (b) wilful insubordination and indiscipline (c) making false allegations amounting to subversion and (d) giving a false certificate specified in its written statement. On this Shri Gulab Gupta has argued that the termination of Dr Chaudhary's services should be held to be illegal and improper because the company had not under its standing order served a charge sheet on the doctor charging him with all these misconducts and had further not held a departmental enquiry with regard to them. He has therefore argued that the termination of the services of Dr Chaudhary was against the provision of the standing orders of the company and against the rule of natural justice and it was, therefore, illegal and improper and should be set aside as such. To this Shri Saraf has argued that the company by para 22 of its written statement had "further" sought to justify the termination of the services of the medical officer because he had been guilty of the misconducts of negligence in duty, insubordination and indiscipline and acts amounting to subversion, that the company's case was that being a probationer the company was justified in terminating his services at any time before his confirmation but that if that contention was not accepted then the company's further case was that the dismissal was also justified on the grounds of negligence in duty, wilful insubordination and indiscipline making false allegation amounting to subversion and giving false certificate instances of which the company has specified on its written statement.

17 It is now well settled that even though the management may not have served a workman with a charge-sheet and may also have failed to hold a departmental enquiry it would be open to the management to justify its action by leading evidence at the hearing before the Tribunal on the acts of negligence misconduct etc. on which it may seek to justify the workman's termination from service.

18 I have therefore heard the submissions of the parties on the union's contention that Dr Chaudhary had been victimised because he favoured the union and the management's contention that on the merits also Dr Chaudhary's dismissal for the various misconducts alleged by it in its written statement. At the hearing both parties filed a number of documents and led oral evidence in support of their respective contentions. In my view it is really not necessary to go into this question because I have held that Dr Chaudhary was a probationer and it was not necessary for the company to justify the termination of his services on the grounds of the misconducts alleged in para 22 of its written statement. But since both the parties have led evidence on the statements contained in para 22 of the company's written statement and have also addressed me at length thereon I shall briefly deal with those points. I do so rather reluctantly because there are certain aspects of it which do not bring out Dr Chaudhary in a favourable light and I would have liked to have avoided making reference to them for the reasons indicated in what I am going to say later.

19 The union in its statement of claim has stated that grounds on which Dr Chaudhary's services were terminated. It has firstly alleged that the doctor was dismissed because the Manager bore ill-will towards him and secondly that Dr Chaudhary was victimised for his having treated the wife of Shri Manoj Singh, President of the branch union at the West Chrimiri Colliery by prescribing penicillin and streptomycin injections much against the wishes of the Manager of the Colliery, who does not recognise the Federation or its branch union at the colliery and who always indulges in anti-union activities. In other words the union's case as stated in its written statement and as sought to be argued by Shri Gulab Gupta at the hearing of the dispute was that the doctor was victimised because he was favouring the union.

20 Now, Dr Chaudhary in his examination in chief at the hearing has more than once stated that his relations with the Manager of the colliery were throughout cordial and he bore no malice. In his own words

"I say that my relations with Shri Gurumukh Singh Manager of the Colliery were throughout cordial"

It will thus be seen that the main allegation in the union's statement of claim for the alleged wrongful termination of the services of Dr Chaudhary is not borne out by the doctor's evidence

21 With regard to the second contention I shall presently deal in a little detailed manner with the facts of the treatment given by Dr Chaudhary to Mrs Makhan Singh the wife of the President of the branch union. But with regard to the allegation of the union that Dr Chaudhary was victimised because he favoured the union, I may say that the doctor in his evidence has nowhere stated that he was a member of the branch union nor has that averment been made in the statement of claim of the union. Shri Kuldeep (WW2) the Secretary of the Branch union at the colliery when cross-examined on the question of the doctor being a member of the union stated in his evidence before me as follows—

No application form for membership is made to be signed by the applicant for membership of our union. He is issued a receipt. The receipt is given when he pays the membership fee. Counterfoil of the receipt issued is kept. I do not remember the date of the counterfoil of the membership fee paid by Dr H M Chaudhary. The counterfoil is also not in my branch union office as it has been sent to the head office at Chirmiri at the end of the year.

To say the least, with this state of the evidence regarding the doctor's connection with the union the story that he was dismissed because he was supporting the branch union becomes at the very start very doubtful. The management has also drawn attention to the fact that whilst in the statement of claim of the union dated 27th December 1962 it was specifically stated that Dr Chaudhary had not till that date got employment elsewhere. Dr Chaudhary in his oral evidence admitted that he had received a letter of appointment from the National Coal Development Corporation in the second week of November 1962. With these preliminary remarks I proceed to discuss briefly the allegations of misconduct against the doctor made by the company in its written statement.

22 Among the charges of negligence of duty which the company has alleged against the doctor is that Dr Chaudhary did not care to comply with the directions received from the Civil Surgeon Surguja regarding some information required to be furnished to him and the doctor's explanation is that he could not read the contents of that letter (Ex E-14) which is in Hindi and he had made an endorsement to that effect. In fact exhibit E 14 was a reminder to an earlier letter on the same subject and the company's grievance is that it had remained unattended to due to the negligence of Dr Chaudhary. But in view of the endorsement of Dr Chaudhary on exhibit E-14 I am inclined to give him the benefit of doubt in this matter and I would not therefore hold that he has been guilty of such negligence in this matter of which notice can be taken.

23 The next ground urged is that Dr Chaudhary failed to report leprosy cases among the workers at the colliery as required by circular dated 5th February 1962 received by the colliery from the Deputy Commissioner Coal Mines Welfare Organisation (Ex E-35). The information was required by the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation because it was to reserve certain beds in its Hospital for the treatment of leprosy cases among colliery workers. The evidence on this point is that the colliery office had endorsed the circular (exhibit E-35) to the medical officer who had returned the same after endorsing the remark 'Seen and thereafter taken no action on it'. The company's case is that there had been a number of cases of leprosy at its colliery and it was admitted at the hearing that Dr Chaudhary had failed to report those cases as directed by the circular. Dr Chaudhary questioned about this stated in his examination in chief that the communication from the Deputy Commissioner Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner was brought to him by a peon who asked him to read it and initial it in token of his having seen it and he did so and handed it back to the peon. Dr Chaudhary has stated that thereafter he had reported at least two leprosy cases to the Manager and that both these were sent by the Manager for treatment outside. The Manager of the colliery Shri Gurumukh Singh in his evidence has denied that the doctor had at all furnished to him any information about leprosy cases. He has stated that by Ex E-35 the company was required to furnish a list of the names of the miners in the colliery who were suffering from leprosy and that it was Dr Chaudhary's duty to have done so. I was not impressed by Dr Chaudhary's story that the peon had asked him merely to put his initials on the circular and that he was not required to take any further action in the matter. I am inclined to feel that Dr Chaudhary neglected to send the required information to the Deputy Commissioner Coal Mines Welfare Organisation and that on this point there is sufficient evidence to justify the company's allegation of negligence of duty by the Doctor. In my opinion the company was right when it contended that it was necessary to segregate the leprosy cases from

the other workers in order to avoid the infection spreading to other workers and that Dr. Chaudhary's failure to report these cases had not taken this important factor into account.

24 The third act of negligence alleged by the company is in the case of a workman who was suffering from an acute attack of appendicitis. The management's complaint appears to be that Dr. Chaudhary prescribed penicillin injections instead of giving the patient a morphine or atropine injection. He also complained that Dr. Chaudhary's treatment of that case was not on the right lines or satisfactory. Dr. Chaudhary in his evidence has stated that the line of treatment which he followed was the correct one. It is a question of medical opinion on which I prefer to accept the statement of Dr. Chaudhary rather than that of the Manager of the colliery who had of course spoken as a layman. I am, therefore, satisfied that there is not sufficient ground for finding that Dr. Chaudhary had acted negligently in that case.

25 The fourth instance is a minor one and relates to the diet that had to be given to one Jadoo a workman who was suffering from mumps. The complaint is that Dr. Chaudhary told the patient to chew rice which he could not do and that the Superintendent of the Miners' Hostel provided him with "Sahoo Kanji" which proved satisfactory. This is too minor a matter to be taken notice of. The other allegation that Jadoo had paid Rs. 16/- to Dr. Chaudhary for treatment for pain in the leg could not be substantiated because there was no direct evidence led on the point.

26. The next item of negligence relates to the case of a workman who was found drunk and who was sent to Dr. Chaudhary for examination and report whether the worker was drunk or not. Instead of giving his finding whether the workman was drunk or not Dr. Chaudhary sent a report stating that there was no sign of alcoholic poisoning. The company's complaint is that the doctor had evaded giving a direct finding whether the workman was drunk or not. Dr. Chaudhary's explanation is that as it was not possible to send samples of the gastric juice for chemical analysis, he used to make a clinical examination of the workers sent to him and if there were no signs of alcoholic poisoning he certified them as such. He stated that this meant that in his opinion the worker was not drunk. I am not satisfied with this explanation. Surely even on a clinical examination the doctor should have been able to certify whether the workman was drunk or not and that was the point on which the management wanted his opinion. Stating that the workman was not suffering from alcoholic poisoning would really not be the proper reply to the query addressed by the management to the doctor. I must hold on this issue that I am not satisfied that Dr. Chaudhary was right in submitting the kind of report he had submitted, which would be misleading.

27. The next item of negligence of duty against the doctor was in the case of a workman named Dukha who was referred to him but instead of treating him in the hospital the doctor prescribed some medicines to be purchased from outside. But this matter came to the notice of the Manager who however, got him treated at the colliery dispensary. Dr. Chaudhary when questioned about this case stated that he did not remember this case and was therefore, not in a position to offer any explanation. There is, however, not sufficient evidence on record to hold that Dr. Choudhary was guilty of negligence in this case.

28. The next case of negligence was with regard to a workman named Kapur Singh who, according to the management, received injuries in his eye whilst on duty. The management's case is that instead of arranging for proper treatment of Kapur Singh, Dr. Chaudhary told him to go out for treatment at his own expense, as according to Dr. Choudhary it was not possible to treat this case properly at the colliery dispensary. Dr. Chaudhary when questioned about this matter in his examination in chief has stated that on 1st December, 1962, Kapur Singh had gone to him stating that some foreign matter had dropped in his eye while he was on duty; that thereupon Dr. Chaudhary removed the foreign matter from the eye and applied the necessary medicines. However, two or three days later he found that Kapur Singh's eye had not healed. Thereupon he wrote a personal note to the Manager of the Colliery requesting him to purchase locally an ointment which he had prescribed. Dr. Chaudhary has stated that he gave his personal letter and the prescription to Kapur Singh to take to the Manager. Later, either Kapur Singh or the store keeper had come and told him that the ointment was not available locally at Chirimiri and the Manager had asked him to prescribe a substitute medicine. Thereupon, he prescribed a substitute medicine which he supplied to Kapur Singh's eye. Thereafter, on 12th February, 1962, Kapur Singh saw him again and complained of severe pain in the affected eye. The doctor then examined Kapur Singh's eye clinically, but could not find any

gross lesion and he, therefore, advised Kapur Singh that if, within the next two or three days, there was no improvement he should go outside for further investigation and treatment. According to the doctor later that day the Manager of the colliery Shri Gurumukh Singh, the workshop-in-charge Shri Sarmukh Singh along with Kapur Singh came to the hospital and the Manager directly charged him why he had not intimated this case as of injury on duty to him and why he had asked the patient workman to go outside for better treatment. He thereupon told the Manager that he had already intimated about Kapur Singh's case by a personal letter and that the Manager himself had got the medicine purchased. It was over this incident that the Manager had spoken to Dr. Chaudhary in a loud tone for which he had expressed his written regret contained in a note dated 12th February, 1962, in his handwriting which he had written to Dr. Chaudhary and which is on record as exhibit W-7. In his cross-examination Dr. Chaudhary stated that as far as he was aware he had removed the foreign matter fully but it might be that some foreign matter may have penetrated into the deeper tissues of the eye which he could not visualise in normal light. Whilst I am not prepared to state that the evidence on record is sufficient to establish negligence on the part of the doctor, at the same time I am not impressed by the replies of Dr. Chaudhary in his cross-examination. I also feel that it was Dr. Chaudhary's duty to have informed the Manager of this being a case of accident whilst on duty and I am satisfied that the doctor had failed in his duty to so inform the Manager. As stated by me earlier it is with regard to this case that the Manager had spoken in a loud tone to Dr. Chaudhary and Shri Gurumukh Singh appears to have felt sorry for this and he thereupon wrote a note to Dr. Chaudhary on 12th February, 1962, in his own handwriting in which he expressed his sorrow for having spoken to the doctor in too loud a tone and asked him to excuse him for it (Exhibit W-7). In the note he however, requested Dr. Chaudhary to be careful in future so that accident cases received proper treatment at the proper time since it was a responsibility of the management of which the doctor himself was also a part. The union on the basis of this letter has levelled a general charge against the Manager that, "he had misbehaved with the doctor many times" and apologised for the same. I am inclined to think that the Manager had acted rather sportingly in expressing his regret to the doctor for having spoken to him in a loud tone and on this incident I am inclined to think that the Manager has emerged in a better light than the doctor. The general allegation of the union about the Manager is further falsified by the statement of Dr. Chaudhary in his examination in chief that he was on the most cordial terms with the Manager.

29. The management in its written statement has also charged Dr. Chaudhary with wilful insubordination and indiscipline. The first instance of this type of misconduct as stated in the company's written statement is that on 17th March, 1962, the Manager of the colliery was to go out of station and he wanted to discuss some hospital matters with the doctor and he requested the doctor to see him by 7-30 P.M. Dr. Chaudhary wrote back that he had other engagements and he could not meet the Manager before 7-30 P.M. and he also did not meet the Manager even after 7-30 P.M. Dr. Chaudhary's explanation for this as given in his evidence is that he sent a note expressing his inability to meet the Manager (Exhibit E-1) at 7-30 P.M. on that day as he was just then leaving to attend an emergency case of the wife of a workman at the colliery siding. In his cross-examination on this point he admitted that he had in his note not stated that he could not meet the Manager because he was engaged in treating a member of a workman's family. There is also no entry in any of the registers maintained by the doctor to support his story. But this is hardly an incident which can be held to be a case of insubordination or indiscipline.

30. The next charge under this head is that Dr. Chaudhary made an application to the head office of the company for his confirmation without consulting the Manager. Dr. Chaudhary's explanation is that since the letter of appointment was received by him from the head office he thought that an application to the head office was the proper thing to do. One would have thought that Dr. Chaudhary would have informed the Manager of his having applied to the head office for his confirmation. The fact that he subsequently did not submit an application through the Manager, would suggest that he was trying to secure his confirmation over the head of the Manager under whose charge he was working at the colliery. In that sense his conduct in this matter appears to be an act of indiscipline.

31. The next charge under this head is that the doctor had written a letter to the Superintendent of the Central Hospital at Asansol concerning a worker of the colliery without the knowledge of the Manager. This fact was revealed when a reply to that letter addressed to the medical officer of the colliery was intercepted in the office. When questioned about this Dr. Chaudhary in his examination in

chief stated that sometimes with the consent of the Manager he may have corresponded with the Superintendent of the Central Hospital at Dhanbad or Asansol and that the correspondence related to the treatment of patients and sometimes for medicines for the domiciliary treatment of patients. The Manager, Shri Gurmukh Singh (EW-1) denied his ever having given any such permission. The management's grievance appears to be that the doctor was conveying to the Superintendents of the Central Hospital at Dhanbad and Asansol that the colliery dispensary was not maintaining proper medicines. I think on this score the grievance of the Manager appears to be justified.

32. The next charge against Dr. Chaudhary is that he had been making false allegations amounting to subversion. The company's case is that Dr. Chaudhary was not giving proper information about the hospital to the Manager. In the daily report form a column for particulars of special requirements exists and the company's grievance is that Dr. Chaudhary never mentioned any of his requirements about medicines in this column but that he had been telling all and sundry that there was no medicine in the hospital and that on 9th March, 1962, the Union Secretary had made a complaint in writing stating that Dr. Chaudhary had been telling the workers that there was no medicine in the hospital. The union's case both in its written statement and at the hearing was that the management was not keeping the necessary medicines which were needed, but according to Shri Gurmukh Singh the company had not only been maintaining all the medicines required to be kept at the colliery dispensary by the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation but also other medicines. I have considered the documentary and oral evidence on the point and I am of the opinion that the management was maintaining all the medicines which were required to be kept in the colliery dispensary by the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation. It may be that the Manager may have been rather strict about the doctor prescribing for the staff, only such medicines as the colliery was required to maintain in its dispensary and may not have favoured the doctor prescribing medicines which would be required to be purchased from outside. But this does not mean that the colliery dispensary was not being run on the lines prescribed by the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation. The company has relied upon the annual reports for four years ending 31st December, 1959, 31st December, 1960, 31st December, 1961, and 31st December, 1962, (Exhibit E: 31 to Ex. E-34) in which it had been given a clean certificate in respect of inspection of its dispensary. It also appears from exhibits W-10 and W-10A, that the list of medicines to be kept in the colliery dispensary was checked by the Manager along with the doctor. The Manager in his evidence has stated that as he felt that the quantities of certain items to be indented were more than what would be required, he had asked the doctor to reduce them. In my opinion on this question I must place reliance upon the inspection reports on the colliery dispensary exhibits (E-31 to E-34) of the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation in all of which it is stated that the dispensary had satisfied the requirements prescribed by the Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner. Another piece of evidence which is in favour of the management is that in the daily reports which the doctor made there is a column provided for the doctor mentioning any special requirements that may be necessary, and the doctor had not in the daily reports filed for the period between 22nd May, 1962, and 10th July, 1962, (exhibit E-23 collectively) made mention of any special requirement which he needed. I am not satisfied with Dr. Chaudhary's explanation that he was not told that he could state his requirements of any medicines and indent the same through the daily reports.

33. This brings me to the case regarding the treatment given to the wife of Shri Makhan Singh who is the President of the branch union at the colliery. According to the union Dr. Chaudhary prescribed a certain injection to be given to Mrs. Makhan Singh but that the compounder gave some other injection and that when Dr. Chaudhary went to give that injection he had detected that an ampule containing a wrong injection had been brought. All sorts of motives have been attributed to the compounder and the management over this incident but as it turned out in the end the proper injection which had been prescribed was given to Mrs. Makhan Singh. It appears to me that the union officials are not well disposed towards the compounder and a female nurse in the dispensary of the colliery and the union had addressed a complaint to the Coal Mines Welfare Organisation against that compounder and the nurse. The allegation of the union is that the compounder and nurse are favourites of the management. Explanation of the management was thereupon called for by the Commissioner, Coal Mines Welfare Organisation in respect of the complaint made by the union and it appears that upon the management having submitted its explanation, no action was taken in the matter. With regard to Makhan Singh's case, as I have stated, ultimately on that very day though later than would have been possible if the mistake had not been made by the compounder, the injection in fact was given. Dr. Chaudhary

had stated that he gave the injection on a second visit which he had to pay to the residence of Makhan Singh but the management has pointed out that in the daily report for 23rd May 1962 (part of exhibit E-23 collectively) there is no mention about the second visit to Makhan Singh's house. I am afraid the real fact of the matter is that the union is opposed to some members of the staff viz. the compounder and the nurse at the colliery dispensary and it appears to me that Dr. Chaudhary had unfortunately allowed himself to get mixed up and take sides in this controversy.

34. The last case to which the management has referred in its written statement is that of a workman named Ram Parikhan whom Dr. Chaudhary had first examined on 6th April 1962 and certified as being under 18 years (Exhibit E-2) and thus not fit for employment. It appears that the company had introduced a practice of medical examination of newly recruited persons and it was therefore, that Ram Parikhan was sent to Dr. Chaudhary to determine whether he was of the age when he could be employed. Later, it appears that Dr. Chaudhary on 17th April 1962 made the following endorsement on Ex. E-2:

"According to the attached Horoscope of Ram Parikhan his date of birth is 7th August 1941. So according to his horoscope he is now 20 years 8 months. So, he is fit for duty".

Dr. H. M. CHAUDHARY,
17-4-1963.

The management has in this case stated that the doctor could not justifiably rely upon the horoscope when he had only about 10 days earlier on physical examination certified the workman as being below 18 years. Dr. Chaudhary has drawn attention to the question mark after the words "Below 18 years" which he had written in Exhibit E-2. If anything, that in my opinion makes his story all the more difficult to believe as clearly that certificate had come to him again on 17th April 1962. In this case there was in my opinion room for suspicion by the management that the Doctor had not sufficient justification for changing his opinion and he should have relied on his opinion about the workers' age which he had formed after his physical examination and not relied upon the horoscope, which, as is well known, are not very difficult to obtain.

25. The management has urged that the claim of Dr. Choudhary for re-instatement in service in this colliery was not *bona fide* and that this claim was being pressed by him only in the hope of his getting some monies out of the colliery. In support the company has stated that Dr. Chaudhary had, since he gave up service, secured employment as an Assistant Medical Officer with the National Coal Development Corporation in November 1962 on better salary than in this colliery and that the statement in the Union's written statement dated 27th December 1962 that he was un-employed till then was deliberately false. The doctor had applied for the job in the National Coal Development Corporation in February 1962 when he was in the employment of this colliery and it must be presumed that he wanted to join that service because he felt that his prospects there were better. It is quite clear to me that Dr. Chaudhary is now unquestionably in a better job with better prospects and I am far from impressed by Shri Gulab Gupta's rather vehement argument that Dr. Chaudhary would be better off if he is re-instated in service in this company. As at the hearing this point was argued at considerable length and with some emphasis by Shri Gulab Gupta it is necessary to refer to it in some detail. Now it is admitted that Dr. Chaudhary joined the West Chirimiri Colliery as Medical Officer in the pay scale of Rs. 450-25-650 and on the date of his dismissal he was, besides the Basic pay of Rs. 450/-, getting certain other benefits the monetary value of which is as follows:—

Rs. 450 Basic pay

Rs. 32 Monetary value of the free residential accommodation which the colliery was providing him—this being the value put upon this benefit by the company for the purposes of calculation of Income-tax.

Rs. 10 Monetary value of the coal and electricity benefits as claimed by Dr. Chaudhary.

Rs. 492

It is further admitted by Dr. Chaudhary in his evidence that he has been appointed in the National Coal Development Corporation in the scale of pay of Rs. 400-930. Besides this he gets a non-practice allowance of Rs. 200/- per month and also gets a project allowance. I regret to have to state that when Mr. Chaudhary was being

questioned in examination-in-chief about his pay in the National Coal Development Corporation he did not disclose that he was getting the non-practice allowance of Rs. 200/- p.m. as also a project allowance—he having by now get about Rs. 225/- as project allowance since he joined the National Coal Development Corporation's service in November 1962. The facts of the payment of these allowances were elicited from him only in cross-examination. He has, however, to pay a house rent allowance of 10% of his salary, which on his present salary is Rs. 60/- per month and he has to pay electricity charges which were computed by him at Rs. 5/- per month.

36. Therefore what Dr. Chaudhary is now getting in the National Coal Development Corporation is as follows:—

Rs. 400	Basic pay
Rs. 200	Non-practice allowance
+ Rs. 20	Project allowance (He has admitted that from November 1962 till say October 1962 he had got Rs. 225/- by way of Project allowance i.e. a little more than Rs. 20/- per month)
Rs. 620	
—Rs. 60	House rent
Rs. 560	
—Rs. 5	Electricity charges
Rs. 555	

As against this he was getting only Rs. 492 in the West Chirimiri Colliery. Even adding to this the annual increment of Rs. 25/- to which he would have been entitled only on 8th August 1962, as claimed by Shri Gulab Gupta, his total emoluments at West Chirimiri would have been Rs. 517/- which would have been less than his present emoluments in the National Coal Development Corporation where he is drawing Rs. 555/-. Even excluding the project allowance he would get Rs. 535/-, which would even then be higher than what he was getting at West Chirimiri Colliery. In desperation Shri Gulab Gupta, wanted me to take into account the benefit of free railway fare on leave which he would have got in the West Chirimiri Colliery on completion of one year service. But that is hardly a benefit which can have any weight when comparing the over-all benefits of the two services. Shri Gulab Gupta has argued that in the National Coal Development Corporation Dr. Chaudhary is a relieving doctor and has, during the last 11 months, been shifted to different centres of the National Coal Development Corporation. He has argued that the life of a doctor in the National Coal Development Corporation is an unsettled one. He has also urged me to take into account that till he got his appointment in November 1962 in the National Coal Development Corporation Dr. Chaudhary was unemployed for four months from August 1962.

37. In my opinion there is substance in the company's contention that Dr. Chaudhary's claim for re-instatement is not *bona fide*. There are two factors which in my opinion establish the validity of this contention. The first is that Dr. Chaudhary applied for this job in the National Coal Development Corporation in February 1962 when he was already in the service of the company and the reason for doing so as stated by him in his application for a non-objection certificate from the West Chirimiri management was that he wanted to apply to use his own language - for "better prospective chance" (Ex. F. 15). The doctor must be deemed to have considered and decided that his prospects in the National Coal Development Corporation were better than his prospects in the West Chirimiri Colliery before applying for the National Coal Development Corporation job. It must be remembered that this application was made by him in February 1962—even before he had made his application for confirmation. Secondly, it is quite clear that in the National Coal Development Corporation the pay scale is much better than that in the West Chirimiri Colliery. Though the start in the National Coal Development Corporation is slightly lower being Rs. 400/-; the maximum in the National Coal Development Corporation's scale is Rs. 950/- as against the maximum of only Rs. 600/- in the West Chirimiri Colliery. Besides in the National Coal Development Corporation he gets a non-practice allowance of 50% of his pay, as also a substantial project allowance. The National Coal Development Corporation is a much bigger organisation as compared to the West Chirimiri Colliery which is a single unit—and which cannot be called a big colliery and where there are no prospects of promotion. I am, therefore, more than satisfied that there is substance in the company's contention that the Dr. Chaudhary's claim to be re-instated in service is not *bona fide*, and I hold accordingly

38. With regard to his earned wages and other dues from the West Chirimiri Colliery the same were tendered to Dr. Chaudhary by Money Order which he refused to accept.

39. After a careful consideration of the oral and documentary evidence on record, though I am not satisfied that Dr. Chaudhary has been guilty of all the misconducts with which the management has charged him, there is sufficient evidence on the record to establish that his conduct has not been free from blame in respect of some of the incidents referred to in the company's written statement which I have indicated supra.

40. On an anxious consideration of the facts of the case, I am constrained to hold that Dr. Chaudhary had not shown as much diligence and attention in the discharge of his duties as would be expected of a Medical Officer on probation and that he had unfortunately allowed himself to take sides in the controversy relating to the staff in the dispensary and its conduct.

41. In the result, I hold that the management was justified in terminating the services of Dr. H. M. Chaudhary with effect from 1st August 1962 and that he is not entitled to any relief, and I answer the reference accordingly.

No order as to costs.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT,

Presiding Officer,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal,
Bombay.

[No. 5/24/62-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 28th November 1963

S.O. 3388.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3043, dated the 18th October, 1963, published on page 3857 of Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) of the **Gazette of India, dated the 26th October, 1963, namely:—**

In the Schedule appended to the said Order, the following sentence shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

"If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. 1/15/62-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 29th November 1963

S.O. 3389.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, No. S.O. 1712, dated the 11th June, 1963, the Central Government being satisfied that the public interest so required, had declared the industry for the supply of milk under the Delhi Milk Scheme to be a public utility service for the purposes of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) for a further period of six months from the 22nd June, 1963;

And whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 22nd December, 1963.

[No. 1/60/63-LR.I.]

New Delhi, the 30th November 1963

S.O. 3390.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Palana Colliery, Palana, Rajasthan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th November, 1963.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

In the matter of a Reference under Section 16(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947).

REFERENCE No. 33 OF 1963

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Palana Colliery, Palana, Rajasthan,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Sri Raj Kishore Prasad, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers: Shri H. C. Gupta, Mine Manager, Palana Colliery

For the workmen: Dr. Jawahar Lal Ajmani, Patron, with Sri Arjun Ram, President, Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union.

STATE: Rajasthan,

INDUSTRY: Mining.

Camp: Bikaner, dated the 22nd November, 1963

AWARD

Ministry of Labour & Employment, by its Order No. 5/22/62-LRII, dated 6th December 1962 referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to Palana Colliery of Rajasthan and their workmen in respect of the matter specified below, under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, where it was numbered and registered as I.D. 332 of 1962; but subsequently on 20th March 1963 it was transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Palana Colliery, Palana, was justified in terminating the services of Shri Peerdan, Register Clerk, from the 1st July, 1960? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

2. This reference was fixed for hearing at Bikaner on 20th November 1963 when both the parties adduced documentary evidence and the workmen concerned examined himself and arguments were also heard but the making of the award was reserved, as the parties intimated that they were likely to compromise all the dispute pending between them before this Tribunal and, therefore, time was granted

3. On 21st November 1963 both the parties brought a joint petition of compromise and signed and filed it before me and prayed that an award be passed in terms of it.

4. I have read the terms of compromise and I find that they are very reasonable and fair and in the interest of both the parties, and, therefore, I accept the said compromise.

5. I, therefore, make an award in terms of the petition of compromise dated 21st November 1963, which is marked Annexure 'A' and made a part of this award. This is the award which I make and submit to the Government of India under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Sd./- RAJ KISHORE PRASAD,
Presiding Officer,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal,
Dhanbad.

CAMP: Bikaner;

The 22nd November, 1963.

ANNEXURE "A"

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
DHANBAD

(CAMP BIKANER)

In the matter of Reference No. 33 of 1963.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Palana Colliery,

AND

Their workmen represented by the Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union.
May it please the Hon'ble Tribunal

The parties concerned in the above Reference No. 33 of 1963 have reached the following settlement:—

The parties are agreed that the management shall reinstate Shri Peerdan, S/o Hari Ram as Clerk in clerical grade II with effect from 1st July 1960 with continuity of service. The parties are further agreed that the Management shall pay 50 per cent of the wages excluding Bonus and leave wages for the intervening period i.e. from 1st July 1960 to the date of signing this agreement.

Parties pray that the Award may be passed in terms of this settlement.

No order as to the cost.

Sd./- H. C. GUPTA,
Mine Manager,
Palana Colliery, Palana.

Sd./- DR. JAWAHAR LAL,
Patron,
Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union,
Bikaner.

Sd./- G. L. MATHUR,
Labour Welfare Officer,
Palana Colliery, Palana.

Sd./- ARJUN RAM,
President,
Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union.

Signed and filed before me.

Sd./- RAJ KISHORE PRASAD,
Presiding Officer,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal,
Dhanbad.

[No. 5/22/62-LR. II.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 23rd November 1963

S.O. 3391.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Jamadoba and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the discharge from service of Shri Ram Nandan Singh, Mazdoor, Central Coal Washing Plant, Jamadoba, Post Office Jealgora with effect from the 13th July, 1963, by the management of Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 2/58/63-I-LR.II.]

S.O. 3392.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Jamadoba Colliery of

Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Jamadoba and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri Sukhlal, Mining Sirdar, Ticket No. 20610, Jamadoba Colliery, Post Office Jealgora by the management of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited with effect from the 13th July, 1963, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 2/58/63-II-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 27th November 1963

S.O. 3393.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bankola Colliery, Post Office Ukhra, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Sarvashri Badal Bowri and Kalo Bowri, Pick Dressers of Bankola Colliery from the 27th February, 1963 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?

[No. 6/26/63-LR.II.]

A. L. HANDA, Under Secy.